Brescia College Library
PT313.R72 c.1
Rose, William.
From Goethe to Byron; the develop
3 6277 15987772 1

URSULINE COLLEGE
BRESCIA HALL

LIBRARY

8757- PT 313 V4
R72

THE GIFT OF
THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK

C. A. Dawson-Scott

With Compliments

from

William Rose

7 Dec 1925

FROM GOETHE TO BYRON

FROM GOETHE TO BYRON

THE DEVELOPMENT OF 'WELTSCHMERZ' IN GERMAN LITERATURE

BY

WILLIAM ROSE, M.A., Ph.D.

Lecturer in German in the University of London, King's College

8757

LONDON

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LTD.

NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.

1924

LIBRARY
BRESCIA HALL, LONDON

Printed in Great Britain by
F. Robinson & Co. at The Library Press, Lowestoft

To

PROFESSOR J. G. ROBERTSON

In grateful regard

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	1
INTRODUCTION—Definition	5
The Origins of Weltschmerz in the 18th Century	11
GOETHE	19
STURM UND DRANG—	
J. M. R. LENZ	53
F. M. KLINGER	67
J. A. LEISEWITZ	72
H. L. WAGNER and MALER MÜLLER	75
GÖTTINGER DICHTERBUND—	
J. M. MILLER	83
HÖLTY	86
MATTHISSON	87
THREE AUTOBIOGRAPHIES—	
K. P. MORITZ	91
JUNG-STILLING	109
Th. G. von HIPPEL	115
F. H. JACOBI	119
SCHILLER	131
HEINSE	147
F. M. KLINGER (later period)	153
JEAN PAUL	169
CONCLUSION	185
* * * *	
NOTES	195
CHRONOLOGY	205
BIBLIOGRAPHY	207

FOREWORD

> "Literary history is, in its profoundest significance, psychology, the study, the history of the soul."—GEORG BRANDES, *Main Currents in 19th Century Literature.*

The great reputation of Byron in Germany and his considerable influence on German literature form a psychological problem, that can only be solved by an investigation of the underlying causes that helped to render him so much more popular on the Continent than in England. New literary movements do not spring up in a single night, but the way is always prepared for them by forces which have been working beneath the surface for a considerable period beforehand. It is obvious that when a poet like Byron suddenly springs into eminence, he cannot be an isolated phenomenon. There was "Byronism" before Byron, and in order to define a term which is but loosely understood and as loosely

employed, it is essential to trace the symptoms in the years preceding the Byronic age. Weltschmerz was epidemic in German literature for the forty years or more which preceded the publication of *Childe Harold*, but it has never before been submitted to any systematic analysis. There is no doubt equal scope for an enquiry into the symptoms of " le mal du siècle " in France before Chateaubriand, while a study on the same lines of the precursors of Byron in England should yield fruitful results.

The problem is a very wide one and is not restricted to the late 18th and early 19th centuries. It is of particular importance at the present time to arrive at a proper understanding of a psychic state whose significance for literature has hitherto been greatly underestimated. Weltschmerz has existed as long as men have sought ideals which this world cannot provide, and a study of it is a study of the soul in one of its noblest aspects, though its practical effects are often pernicious. After the Napoleonic wars, the poets who had seen the old order destroyed and yet could see no signs of the beginning of the new, gave expression to their disillusionment and despair

in an outburst of Weltschmerz. The words of Alfred de Musset apply to the present generation in even greater measure than to the generation to whom he addressed them. "Toute la maladie du siècle présent vient de deux causes : le peuple qui a passé par 1793 et par 1814 porte au coeur deux blessures. Tout ce qui était n'est plus : tout ce qui sera n'est pas encore. Ne cherchez pas ailleurs le secret de nos maux." A hundred years later we again stand between two worlds ; the old world has gone, the new has not yet come. The younger generation whose lot is cast in this transition period, and who have an infinite longing for ideals which cannot be fulfilled, will again tend to seek consolation in a divorce from reality. The signs of a new wave of Weltschmerz are already visible, but it is to be hoped that the possibilities of a healthy activity will hinder the pernicious consequences that were seen in former years. It is in any case essential to endeavour to understand the phenomenon, if we are to know where the dangers lie and how they are to be avoided. It used to be the custom to look down deprecatingly on Weltschmerz and to regard it as a sign of satiety, but this psychic

discord is common to all humanity and is found in all great poets. Modern psychology and psycho-analysis afford us many keys to its understanding, and although I lay emphasis on the morbid or pathological side of Weltschmerz, yet this dissonance is an essential quality of the human soul. For if man were content with his environment, there would be no such thing as Art, since Art springs from the feeling of dissatisfaction, from the unsolved conflict between the ideal and the actual, which, for want of a better word, we call Weltschmerz.

The following study was in its original form submitted to the University of London for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and I take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to Professor J. G. Robertson for his encouragement and stimulating advice, and for his invaluable help in reading the proofs. I would also thank the Trustees of the Tiarks Fund, by whose liberality the expense of printing this volume has been partly defrayed.

December, 1923. WILLIAM ROSE.

INTRODUCTION

DEFINITION.

In order to offer a definition which shall embrace the various aspects of Weltschmerz, not merely during the period under review but also in its subsequent developments, it is only possible to couch it in general terms. It will then be necessary to see what kind of temperament fosters Weltschmerz, what are its symptoms and to what spiritual and material consequences it leads.

Weltschmerz is the psychic state which ensues when there is a sharp contrast between a man's ideals and his material environment, and his temperament is such as to eliminate the possibility of any sort of reconciliation between the two. The result is a nostalgia for the unattainable, whether the latter be symbolised by a person, a country or a golden age, any of which may or may not exist wholly in the imagination. This definition might of

course be extended to embrace the dissonance between the ideal and the actual which must necessarily exist in the soul of every artist, whether creative or merely receptive, but it must be limited to those in whom the symptoms of psychic disturbance assume a pathological form. It will be obvious that the man who is able to give concrete expression to his longings, or, if these be unattainable, to give them artistic expression, will be less likely to permit his spiritual conflict to obtrude itself unduly into practical life, than the man who is sensitive to outward impressions without possessing the power to return them in the shape of artistic production. That is why Goethe and Schiller conquered their Weltschmerz when lesser talents succumbed. The lack of creative power causes the repression of longings which find their way back in a distorted or exaggerated form, and it is therefore in the minor writers or in the youth of great ones that Weltschmerz will as a rule be found.

The right understanding of Weltschmerz has hitherto been obscured by two fallacies. The first confuses it with pessimism, and this conception makes the vital mistake of looking upon Weltschmerz as a philosophy, whereas

its essence lies in its lack of systematic reasoning. It is a state of mind which does not philosophise but usually contents itself with dreams and complaints. The mind of the Weltschmerzler may be tinged with pessimism or it may be wholly optimistic, and though Weltschmerz leads in some cases to the doctrine of Nirvana, it has by then ceased to be merely a psychic state, and a philosophic pessimism precludes the manifestation of the symptoms which we find in the case of Weltschmerz.

The second fallacy is that the Weltschmerzler *always* regards his own woes as typical of those of the whole world. That is not essential.

The only definition of Weltschmerz which has much value to-day is that of Braun,* who distinguishes two types, the *cosmic* and the *egoistic*. He defines the former as seeing first and foremost the sad fate of humanity and regarding its own misfortunes merely as part of the common destiny, whereas the latter is chiefly aware of its own misery and finally comes to regard it as representative of universal evil. In the eighteenth century, how-

*In the excellent introduction to his book *Types of Weltschmerz in German Poetry* (Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies. Vol. 2, No. 2, 1905) which deals with Hölderlin, Lenau and Heine.

ever, the former was non-existent, and as far as the second phase is concerned, there are only rare traces of the Weltschmerzler coming to regard himself as one of a multitude. On the contrary, it is typical of him that he is the supreme egoist, and looks upon himself either as an unique phenomenon or as one of a select group of supermen. The Weltschmerz of the eighteenth century was individual and, with one or two exceptions, remained individual.

The word " Weltschmerz "* is in fact unsuitable as a description of the spiritual condition of these people, except in so far as it represents the condition of a soul which is out of touch with the world, and it would be more to the point to employ the term " *Ichschmerz*," which would describe the state of an ego that is unable to adapt itself to reality. There can be something sublime in this ego-loneliness, which in its highest moments rises to Promethean defiance, but in the majority of the cases which are about to come under our observation, it emerges into the individual's

* The first use of the word in the modern sense is unknown. It occurs first, but with a different meaning, in Jean Paul's *Selina oder die Unsterblichkeit*, 1827. Heine uses the word, also in a different sense, in his *Gemäldeausstellung in Paris* 1831, and again in the foreword to the *Geständnisse*, 1854. Cf. G. Büchmann : *Geflügelte Worte* and H. Breitinger : *Neues über den alten Weltschmerz*. (Ch. X of *Studien und Wandertage*. Frauenfeld, 1890).

practical life, manifesting itself in all his actions, and it is then that the pathological aspect of Weltschmerz becomes acute.

Though the temperament of the Weltschmerzler is essentially passive, there is often a restless activity which appears to be the outcome of a consuming ambition, but as there is never a clear perception of any definite goal, this restlessness is futile. The power to fulfil is never equal to the desire, but the latter is usually so vague as to consist merely of an uncertain longing, and when there is nothing definite to strive for, any such effort is apt to be aimless. Owing to the impossibility of finding concrete satisfaction for desires that are themselves not concrete, the Weltschmerzler seeks compensation in an imaginary world where he can yield himself to his emotions, and beneath the ferment of restlessness the dreamer sinks back into an inertia where melancholy becomes a source of pleasure. When introspection is pursued to this extent, pathological symptoms will not be long in coming to the surface. The danger is precipitated as soon as the indefinite yearning becomes focussed on some object which is unattainable, with consequent conversion into

a craving. When this object is a member of the opposite sex, and such is usually the case, Weltschmerz finds its outlet through the erotic channel, and it is usually in the sexual sphere that its most pernicious effects become apparent.

This erotic significance cannot be over-estimated, as not only is Weltschmerz always present during the years of puberty, when the psychic life is being revolutionised by the awakening of the sex impulse, but experience also shows that it is the erotic side of one's nature which usually offers the line of least resistance to the practical expression of Weltschmerz. It is well known that erotic emotion is an indispensable factor in the development of the " artistic " mood, and as the latter seeks in the imagination the satisfaction which is lacking in reality, so does the Weltschmerzler, who possesses the artistic temperament in a high degree, tend to live more or less completely in an unreal world of his own design. The consequence is that he does not so much want the object on which his desires appear to be centred, as the half-pleasant, half-painful emotions which the state of longing engenders. The psycho-

analysts say that we imagine what we lack. In the Weltschmerzler there is always a feeling of something lacking, but instead of letting his imagination supply the want in a healthy way, as the creative artist does, he substitutes a new emotion which provides him with a morbid but exquisite pleasure. In essence this new emotion is undoubtedly erotic. The "joy of grief" is a masochistic delight in self-torture which is seen at its height in K. P. Moritz' autobiography, where every outward manifestation of the love-consciousness is entirely lacking. It is a sort of auto-eroticism where the individual strikes emotion out of himself for want of a love-object.

When such an external, attainable object is found, which contains in itself the satisfaction of all longings, the necessary contact with reality is secured. The Weltschmerzler is continually seeking to reconcile poetry and life, and until he does so he must remain subject to Weltschmerz.

THE ORIGINS OF WELTSCHMERZ IN THE 18TH CENTURY.

There has always been Weltschmerz in poetry because it is an indispensable factor in

all tragic art, but it is only in comparatively recent times that a definite Weltschmerz-literature has sprung up. It became epidemic when men lost perspective and the psychological conflict itself became the central theme of interest. That happened in the eighteenth century, and it was in Germany that the full force of the new tendency was first experienced.

The first decades of the nineteenth century have generally been regarded as the period when Weltschmerz was most prevalent. "Byronism" in England and "le mal du siècle" in France were kindred phenomena, and their immediate cause was the disappointment engendered by the failure of the French Revolution to create the new world which had been expected. The actual roots, however, lie deeper and must be sought earlier in the previous century.

Germany is the only country in Europe whose golden age of literature occurred in the eighteenth century, and there also the ideals of the French Revolution were fought for in the field of letters, long before the political explosion in France. Germany's Revolution was Sturm und Drang, and it is significant that the direct line of development

of German literature to Romanticism does not lead from the classical period, but from Sturm und Drang and the sentimentalists through those writers who bear traces of the unsolved conflict of Weltschmerz. There was as much of the latter in the last quarter of the eighteenth century as there was in the first quarter of the nineteenth, but with a difference. In the earlier Weltschmerz can be heard the first stirrings of a new world to be built up on the ruins of the old ; in the post-Revolution Weltschmerz is echoed despair at seeing those hopes dashed to the ground and things left as they were. The first Weltschmerzler were young men who did not know the world and expected great things of it, but Byron, Heine and de Musset were old-young men who had taken what life offered and found its fruits bitter. The Weltschmerz of the latter was a development of the earlier type, but was rendered cosmic and tinged with pessimism by the failure of the French Revolution.

The first hints of the coming change appeared in England, whence numerous influences spread to France and Germany to fan the flames of revolt that were about to flare up there. The most important

factors were the freedom from classical tradition in Shakespeare's plays, the nature-cult of James Thomson's *Seasons*, the melancholy poetry of Young's *Night Thoughts*, the sentimental novels of Richardson, Fielding and Sterne and the misty, northern atmosphere of *Ossian*. From France came the most important influence of all—the nature-philosophy of Rousseau.

These did not find the ground unprepared. The middle classes of Germany lacked all opportunity of finding an outlet in public life for their intellectual activities, the limitation of which to the purely theoretical plane was bound to cause any exaggeration of the imaginative faculty to tend to morbidity. With the awakening of individualism came the realisation of the incompatibility of the existing, wretched political state with ideals of a high order, and the consequence was a longing for natural conditions and a golden age. The world was measured by the ideals of the individual and condemned, but as there were no practical means of expression, the mind soon became concentrated on the mood which resulted from the contemplation of this incompatibility. Dreams and wishes, which

could not be changed into acts of will, led to morbid introspection and an apotheosis of the emotions. There arose two main attitudes to life, both of which were sometimes incorporated in the same individual. Sturm und Drang represented the spirit of titanic revolt, and the Göttinger Hain gave expression to the atmosphere of renunciation and laments.

The birth of the new age was thus announced by a general psychic unrest, by a longing which was later to turn to despair. The tragedy of common life, which had been introduced into Germany by Lessing, was a convenient vehicle for the expression of unrest in individuals whose restriction to the bourgeois sphere hemmed an ambition which embraced the universe. It is not until this period that we meet such individuals in German literature, with a keen sense of personality and insistence on their spiritual rights. It is significant how this generation was driven to the theatre to grasp the illusion of life, whose reality was denied to all but those of wealth or noble birth. The tragedy of common life was essential for the dramatic expression of the discordance between the desire and the power to fulfil, and it was in the eighteenth century

that the awakening individualism of the middle classes gave rise to this contrast.*

The most important preparation for the literary revolution was initiated by Pietism, which arose at the end of the seventeenth century. It encouraged concentration on the inner life, laid stress on the emotions and found vent in ecstatic manifestations. The emotions became an end in themselves both in the religious and the secular sphere, and the way was prepared for the era of sentimentality and Weltschmerz. Romantic longing, which was the common ground of religion and love, formed the background to much of the literature of the time, and it is to be noted that the "Sehnsucht" of the later Romantic poets eventually assumed a religious aspect. It started out from religion and went back to religion.

The *Night Thoughts* of Edward Young, who brought into fashion the mystery of moonlight which exercised such a fascination over German poets until well into the nineteenth century, introduced the joy of grief and an atmosphere of graveyard melancholy, while

* Cf. Georg Brandes: *Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature.* London, 1901. Vol I. p. 26.

Ossian cast a shroud of mist over the whole scene.

Then came the great passion in Werther, who gave expression not merely to the longings of a single individual, but to those of a whole generation, which had already recognised its reflection in Hamlet.

GOETHE

Werther is the analysis of a soul that comes to grief through inability to attain harmony with the outer world. It was written at a time when the young spirits of Germany were in a moral ferment, and intensely dissatisfied with both the spiritual and material conditions of existence. The natural consequences were an inclination to melancholy and revolt against convention. The younger generation, with its irrepressible longing for the simplicity of Nature as opposed to the petrified and antiquated conventions of the age, found in *Werther* its most profound and complete expression, the first plastic representation of the new individualistic tendencies.

The story is simple and there is but little action. It is written in letter form, with a few interpolations by the editor. Werther is a simple, unambitious youth who is contented with the inactive life he is leading in

the country when the story opens. Then one day he meets Lotte, for whom he conceives a deep passion, and only when her fiancé, Albert, returns, does he begin to realise that she is beyond his reach. From now on his condition of morbid despair grows more and more intense, until he goes away to a diplomatic post where he hopes to forget. A social snub, to which he exposes himself, only makes him brood the more, and he throws up his post to return to the town where Lotte, now married to Albert, is living. His mind becomes more and more unbalanced, until his relations with the married couple culminate in a scene in which he loses his self-control and embraces Lotte in the absence of her husband. He returns home and shortly afterwards shoots himself with a pistol which he has borrowed from Albert.

It has been said that *Werther* closed the period of sentimentality and depression, but that is not so. On the contrary, the latter received an added impulse, for it was in *Werther* that this spiritual condition of the seventies of the eighteenth century first found adequate expression. In a conversation with Eckermann, on January 2nd, 1824, Goethe

agrees that the novel would have been epoch-making at any period, but he certainly underestimates the sentimental mood, the "Schwärmerei," of the time. He asserts that the much-discussed Werther-epoch has its place not in the general history of civilisation, but rather in the development of the individual, who, with his innate and independent natural instincts, has to learn to conform to the circumscribed and antiquated conventions of society. Happiness unattained, ambition unfulfilled and desires unsatisfied are the weaknesses not of any particular age, but of every single individual.[1] Goethe in his old age was sometimes liable to slight astigmatism in viewing certain aspects of his youth, and though his remark in the above conversation is perfectly true, and Weltschmerz has always been a characteristic of certain types of humanity, yet he does not bring into line the almost universal prominence of this "pathological condition," as he himself calls it, at the time when he wrote his novel. It is significant that he merely describes the malady without making any attempt to suggest a possible cure.

Werther's outstanding characteristic is a

8757

thorough lack of will-power, whose immediate consequence is a disinclination for action. He is unpractical and passive, and these negative traits derive from his intensified individualism. He says of himself " I turn in upon myself and find a world ! But a world more of presentiment and obscure desire than of plastic living power. And everything swims before my senses, and I wander on my way with a dreamy smile." He is a receptive artist, but lacks creative power, which cannot exist when the soul is so entirely out of harmony with the world. He does not fight against his passion, but even when he can coolly and logically discuss the subject of suicide, which he justifies by argument,he asserts that where passion rules, man is helpless. " Man is man, and the little reason that one may possess does not come much into calculation,when passion rages and the bounds of humanity close one in." This can hardly be called fatalism ; it is a weak yielding to the senses. It is obvious that Lotte is not Werther's fate, but that he carries the seeds of destruction in his own breast.[2] The important factor of the novel is the hero's spiritual condition, and this stands behind and overshadows the meagre action of

the love-episode. All action is reaction of the inward against the outward, and is not an object in itself. Werther's world is in his own breast, and the tragedy is one of susceptibility and not activity. Life in *Werther* is merely a psychic state. He is driven undecided hither and thither by his heart. On November the 24th he hovers between two decisions in a state of utter despair, unable to make up his mind, and on the 26th he utters the half-terrible, half-childish cry: "Have men before me been so wretched?" He possesses in a high degree the sense of isolation, of being misunderstood by his fellow-men. "To be misunderstood is the destiny of a person like me."

It has been said that the victim of romantic melancholy is at times tender and elegiac, at other times a heaven-defying titan.[3] Werther is often tender and often elegiac, but it is difficult, in spite of Gundolf's eloquent claim,[4] to see any titanism in his character. The latter sees as Werther's fundamental characteristic the universally intensified susceptibility and sensitiveness which enable him to sympathise with the impulse of the animated universe. "Werther schliesst sich der Reihe der tita-

nischen Goethe-Symbole, welche zugleich Vereinigung heidnischen Welterlebens mit modernem Ichgefühl sind, an, als der Titan der Empfindung—wie Prometheus der Titan des Schaffens, Cäsar der Tat, Faust des Strebens ist (so paradox es klingen mag, Werther als einen Titanen zu bezeichnen), wenn wir unter einem Titanen ein Wesen verstehen, das die dem Menschen gezogenen Grenzen nach irgend einer Seite, durch irgendwelche Kräfte und Mittel zu überschreiten und zu zersprengen sucht."[5] To call a man a titan, who lives in an imaginary world, however ideal, and succumbs without a struggle the first time he comes up against a brutal reality is to weaken the force of the word. Gundolf admits that Werther differs from Prometheus, Götz, etc., and even from Faust by his *passivity*, but this distinction is vital. Goethe himself might be called a titan, because though he also longed to burst the bonds which hemmed his spiritual and corporeal self, yet he *did* fight and conquer. The desire to overstep the limits of society is not a specifically Weltschmerz characteristic; it becomes Weltschmerz when combined with *inaction*. Goethe depicted in *Werther* his own potentiality as reality, and in representing it

concretely, his good sense prevailed. Werther's place is rather among the men of unsteady purpose, such as Weislingen, Clavigo, Fernando, Tasso and Eduard, though these have their origin in the same discord, viz. the irreconcilability of the desire with the power to fulfil, as the titans.

The diseased side of Werther's character is seen best in the way he derives a deep-seated pleasure from his melancholy brooding. He recognises himself this brooding tendency and promises in his very first letter to cure himself of it. He will reform, and no longer chew the cud of his misfortunes as he has hitherto done. He recognises that there would be less suffering in the world, if people did not occupy their power of imagination in recalling the evils of the past, rather than endure an indifferent present. It is this very power of imagination which causes his ruin. Goethe says himself that Werther undermines his existence by introspection. There is a draft of a revision of the prologue[6] which was probably intended for the second edition, and which contains the significant phrase : " Schöpfe nicht nur wollüstige Linderung aus seinen Leiden." Werther sank into his ego and drew exquisite pain from his own mental sufferings.

His egotism is enormous. He says that a man who wears himself out in the struggle for money or honour or anything else for the sake of others, without its being his own need or passion, is a fool. In his last letter to Lotte, left on his writing-table to be found after his death, he admonishes her to think of him when she climbs the hill, and to gaze across at his grave in the churchyard. The thought of the distress and scandal he is about to cause does not enter his mind, but he intoxicates himself with self-pity as he thinks of the grass on his grave waving in the rays of the setting sun. "On Christmas Eve you will hold this paper in your hand, you will tremble and moisten it with your sweet tears."

There is something of the theatrical poseur about him. The pistol with which he shoots himself must be one of Albert's. He imagines himself lying stretched out on the floor, and sits down to add a postscript to his last letter to Lotte. He casts a romantic halo round his grave. "Oh, I would wish to be buried by the roadside, or in a lonely valley, that priest and Levite should cross themselves as they pass by and the Samaritan shed a tear." Such theatricality is childish.

Werther's propensity for philosophic speculation leads him in the direction of fatalism, which yet does not seem sincere ; all effort is vain and life a dream. When he sees the limitations to which the active and speculative powers of man are subject, and when he sees how all activity is directed towards the satisfaction of needs, which themselves have no other object than the lengthening of our wretched existence ; when he realises that the only result of certain speculations is a dreamy resignation—all this makes him dumb. It appears to him obvious, though nobody wants to believe it, that grown-ups, like children, tumble about on this earth, and like children, do not know whence they come nor whither they are going. His only consolation is the thought that he can quit this " prison " at will. When he complains of the impotence of reason, it is not fatalism that stands behind the words, but inability to resist the passions. His philosophic speculation is mixed up with dreamy " Schwärmerei," and it is this which has undermined his nature.

In spite of the fact that Werther invokes the deity as a personal God, he is essentially pantheistic. He knows that God is not ex-

terior to the world, but that He is immanent in the universe, and that is why his love of Nature bears a religious character, so that when he feels his world falling around him, he despairs at the same time both of Nature and of God.[7] His religious feeling is not profound or definite. He regards himself as the central figure of the universe, is interested in God and Nature only in so far as they affect himself, and his religious emotion manifests itself in a vague yearning. The only support he derives from religion is the consolation he finds in Nature.

The outer world is not a mere frame for the picture, as is generally the case with Rousseau, but the appearance of Nature is interwoven with the mood of the hero. His changing humour is always in harmony with changing Nature, or, in other words, he always sees Nature as coloured by his own varying moods. In the second book (no longer finding a mirror for his own soul in Homer) he plunges into the gloomy, misty world of Ossian.[8] He reads Ossian, because the latter appeals to his mood, and under the influence of the dissolving sentimentality of these songs, his melancholy becomes ever more acute. He transfers the

despair consuming him to surrounding Nature, which even before his departure to take up his diplomatic post appears to him a yawning grave, as formerly it reflected his surging joy in life. His soul is undermined by the consuming power which lies hidden in the universe of Nature ; the power which has formed nothing that has not destroyed its neighbour and itself. " I see nothing but a monster, eternally devouring, eternally chewing the cud." He sees the hopelessness of his position and yet has power for nothing but tears for the sinister future. It is important to notice the way in which the novel opens with Werther happy in the sunny countryside of May, and the development of his ever-growing despair in late autumn and winter until he finds eternal peace with the close of the year.

* * *

The year in which *Werther* was published also saw the publication of the drama *Clavigo*, and in the following year Goethe wrote his drama *Stella*, the name of which was most probably suggested by the analogy of the motive with the double love-affair of Dean Swift.

Clavigo, a successful writer with brilliant

prospects at court, abandons his mistress Marie Beaumarchais, but is pricked by conscience as Goethe was when he left Friederike of Sesenheim. After a stormy interview with her brother, Clavigo returns to Marie, but is encouraged by his friend, the cynical man of the world Carlos, to leave her again, and to employ his influence at court to get rid of the brother. Marie dies of a broken heart, there is a duel at her bier, where Clavigo and Beaumarchais meet accidentally, and Clavigo is killed.

The hero of the second drama is Ferdinand, who deserts his wife Cäcilie, and falls in love with a woman of a different type, named Stella, whom he also deserts. He returns to Stella, but at the same time finds his wife Cäcilie, so that he is unable to make up his mind which of the two to take back. At Cäcilie's suggestion he decides to take them both, and the play ends with all three rejoicing at the happy solution of the difficulty. In the year 1806 the play was produced at Weimar with a different ending. In this version both Ferdinand and Stella commit suicide.

Clavigo exhibits the same weakness of character and lack of resolution as Werther. After

Carlos has painted a fanciful picture of what people will say if he marries Marie, Clavigo bursts into a stream of tears and falls on Carlos' neck: "Save me, Friend! Save me! Save me from double perjury, from immeasurable disgrace, from myself!"

"I had hoped that these youthful frenzies," replies Carlos, "these tempestuous tears, this engulfing melancholy would have passed. I had hoped to see you no longer convulsed by this oppressive lamentation, which you have so often poured out in tears upon my bosom. Be a man!" Clavigo's sole response is: "Let me weep!" With Carlos' "Be a man!" might be compared the fourth line of the strophe which was inserted at the head of the second book of *Werther* in the first edition of 1774: "Be a man, and do not follow me."

In the opening monologue of Act IV, Carlos refers to this trait in his friend's character. "If you are only half as tractable as you used to be, there is still time to preserve you from a folly which, with your lively, sensitive temperament, must cause your life to be wretched and bring you to an untimely grave." And further: "There is nothing

more pitiable in the world than an irresolute man, who hovers between two emotions, would like to combine them both, and does not comprehend that nothing can combine them but the doubt, the uneasiness which torments him."

Carlos, the cool level-headed "Verstandesmensch," the man who is governed by his reason and not by his emotions, as is the "Gefühlsmensch," foreshadows Antonio, to whom Tasso finally turns for consolation as Clavigo now turns to Carlos.

Fernando is of the same mould as Clavigo. He has the strength neither for virtue nor for vice: he has no will, only moods, and the whole piece is pervaded by a Wertherian melancholy.

Werther at least was moved by a great passion, and this brought his Weltschmerz to a head. Neither Clavigo nor Fernando can be said to have been carried away by his love. The former was attracted by a pretty face and was easily persuaded by his Mephisto to change his mind about returning to Marie. Fernando turned, like a boat without a rudder, from Cäcilie to Stella, back again to Cäcilie, and when he could not find the latter, back

once more to Stella, to find a final solution in bigamy. The second and tragic ending cannot be compared with the end of *Werther*; the latter was inevitable, but the second version of *Stella* does not ring true. Goethe has selected one side of his own character, worked up its weaker qualities, and in the fusion of the subjective with the objective, forgotten to add the necessary complementary touches.[9] Fernando is so deplorably weak and unsympathetic, that it is difficult to believe that two such women could fall in love with him. Werther, in spite of the same lack of character, holds our sympathy from the start.

All these highly-strung men suffer not less than the women they have sacrificed to their egoism. Clavigo is tortured by remorse at his betrayal of Marie Beaumarchais, and his eagerness for death springs from an exquisite, fevered desire for expiation. The regret at having quitted his wife and child pursues Fernando even in the arms of Stella and spurs him on to abandon her in turn. Weislingen and Crugantino are a prey to the same pricks of conscience, and Faust indeed is a classic example.

At the same time it is to be noted that in the

case of the majority of these unfaithful lovers, the hero is mentally superior to the woman he betrays, and there is a kind of demoniac force which drives them on.[16] They all have the feminine ideal, always more or less vague, which has been the will o' the wisp of so many men, and which never can be realised, because it exists and can exist only in the imagination. Fernando could not find happiness either with Stella or Cäcilie, but found it (or thought he did) in uniting the two (as in the first version). The "Schauspiel für Liebende," as it was called, could not, however, have ended there. A sixth act would have shewn Fernando a prey to the same restlessness as before, and he would have seen that his vague ideal was still not realised, just as the tragedy of Werther would only have been postponed, had Albert stepped down in his favour. Like Werther, he carried the seeds of his destruction in his own breast.

We have seen how Werther yearned to throw off the prosaic yoke of society, that held down his aspiration to live his life according to the dictates of his heart, but only spent his days in dreams and vain regrets. Clavigo endeavours to dominate society in order to

attain his ends, and tramples love and honour in his path. Fernando by his bigamy oversteps the prevailing moral code. They are both involved in ethical conflicts between inclination and duty. Clavigo and Fernando are somewhat less passive than Werther, though by giving *Stella* a tragic ending, Goethe eliminated what small courage his hero had shewn, and let him take the line of least resistance, as Werther had done. In view of Goethe's well-known disinclination for the tragic ending, however, the first version of *Stella* probably lay nearer to his heart than the second.

In *Stella* there seems to be an attempt to assert the right of passion which the poet Bürger, a contemporary of Goethe, actually realised in a double marriage with two sisters. The Clärchen episode in *Egmont* describes an absorbing love which has no thought of marriage, and the same motive is even more transfigured in *Faust*. In the following words of Stella, the connection between Weltschmerz and eroticism is fairly clear.[11] She says of men : " They make us happy and wretched! With what forebodings of bliss do they fill our hearts, what new and unknown sensations and hopes swell our souls, when their tempestuous

passion is communicated to each of our nerves. How often has everything in me trembled and vibrated, *when he poured out on my bosom in unrestrained tears the sufferings of a world*! I begged him for God's sake to spare himself! —me!—In vain.—He fanned the flames that consumed him into my inmost marrow. And thus the girl became from head to foot all heart, all emotion." The erotic element in the joy of grief is here clearly expressed. Weltschmerz and passion have a reciprocating effect and the one enhances the other.

Faust goes further than either Clavigo or Fernando, and leagues himself with the devil. There is nothing of the titan about either Clavigo or Fernando, and neither would have had the resolution or moral courage to go to the length that Faust does in the endeavour to translate desire into reality. Faust is an enormous step forward in this direction. He also has his vague desires, to "hover with spirits round mountain-caverns and float over meadows in the twilight,"[12] as well as his more solid desire to penetrate the secrets of the universe. Clavigo is a preparation for Faust in that he becomes involved in a conflict between faithfulness to a mistress and the

impulse to free self-development, to which the woman is a hindrance.

* * *

Faust feels deeply the spiritual limits of humanity, and even in his outward life he is restricted. "Es mögt kein Hund so länger leben."[13] For his spiritual yearnings he can find no satisfaction; he has a clear opinion of his superiority to the mass of humanity, as had Werther, and later, Tasso, but at the same time he recognises that the common herd is blissful in its ignorance, while he cannot find happiness in the common joys of life. Here once more we recognise Werther even to the consolation that he can leave the world at will, though the suicide monologue does not appear in the *Urfaust* which has come down to us.[14] Faust wants to grasp the enigma of the universe and to this end he dabbles in magic, and when that is without success, signs his bond with Mephisto in return for the latter's help. At times he too, like Werther, wishes to enjoy nature in a simple, healthy way, but he cannot escape from his own thoughts. His desire for knowledge is too fierce. Like Werther in his happy days, he yearns to raise himself to the gods. He wants to burst the bonds not merely

of society, but of the material world and of thought, and is not content to lie and dream about what he cannot get ; the impulse to act conquers the occasional moments of Weltschmerz. Faust's religion of nature is deeper than that of Werther, who is only interested in external phenomena in so far as they reflect his own moods. The lines "Where can I grasp thee, eternal Nature !" etc.[15] are reminiscent of Werther's letters of the 10th and 17th of May 1771 where he speaks of "the whole wonderful feeling . . . . with which my heart embraces Nature." Werther however did *not* embrace Nature ; he only saw one side of it at a time according to his mood, and did not really understand it.

Werther's longings were eventually turned into the channel of his love for Lotte and thus came up against the hard facts of reality. In the case of Faust the problem is quite different. His striving for infinity is to be fulfilled as far as the limits of humanity permit, and is not to succumb to the ardour of an unsatisfied passion. Werther was the unhappy fruit of this epoch in the life of the poet, Faust was to be the happier.[16]

Faust might be compared to Weislingen,

though the latter is much the weaker character, with high purpose, but no spiritual strength, desirous of translating into reality his spirit of Sturm und Drang, but unable to do so. Clavigo is " Weislingen rounded-off into a principal character," as Goethe himself remarked. Faust possesses independence and energy ; Clavigo has neither, but is only swayed by ambition. The difference is seen most strikingly in a comparison between Act IV. of " Clavigo " and the " Faust, Mephistopheles " scene (later " Trüber Tag ") ; in the former, Carlos uses his persuasive powers and Clavigo submits, but in the latter, it is Faust who imposes his will on Mephisto.

Faust does not dilute his philosophical speculation with " Schwärmerei," as Werther did. " Goethe has imagined a man whose disgust with study and sense of limitation have become an acute disease, so that he is ready to break with the moral order. . . . There was no inner necessity for so doing. . . It is of course to be admitted that the idea of a disappointed dreamer resolving some day in desperation to quit his brooding and enjoy himself in the world, is in itself perfectly natural."[17] The Weltschmerzler may be strong

enough to deduce from his experience the general cause and so conquer his Weltschmerz through philosophizing pessimism, or he may be overwhelmed by the lower elements of human nature, and in the surrender to reality and its sensual delights, seek to forget his sorrow and unrest.[18] This latter course is the one taken by Faust. In the *Urfaust* he appears less susceptible to the higher moods of humanity than in the final version, and his sudden surrender to the baser temptations is not so surprising. He saves himself from succumbing to his Weltschmerz by the pact with Mephisto, which enables him to escape from his brooding self by action, and this involves the second of the two alternatives mentioned above. The symbolic importance is in the *Urfaust* only incidental.

* * *

The drama of *Tasso* has been called the last chord in which are resolved the love-sick dissonances of the Werther-period,[19] and Goethe himself, misquoting Ampère, called his hero an intensified Werther. It remains to examine the extent to which these statements can be justified, and how far *Tasso* is a liquidation of the past.

Goethe presents to us the poet just after he has completed his masterpiece "La Gerusalemme Liberata" and is being honoured by the Duke of Ferrara, at whose court he is living. The return of the minister Antonio from a foreign mission leads to jealousy on the part of Tasso, who is offended at the aloofness and disdain with which the former addresses him. He confides his discontent to the princess Leonore, with whom he is secretly in love, and she persuades him to endeavour to cultivate Antonio's friendship. The latter however only taunts to fever pitch the excitable poet, who draws his sword within the precincts of the palace and is reprimanded by the Duke. Antonio is now anxious to appease Tasso, but the latter suspects all who surround him and decides to leave the palace. He goes to the princess, but instead of taking leave of her, he confesses his love and embraces her. He is of course repulsed, but Antonio approaches him with words of friendship, and the lonely poet, feeling himself on the verge of an abyss, clings to the experienced man of the world as his only hope of salvation.

Tasso's self-distrust or lack of confidence in himself is manifested from the start when he

deprecates the honour of the laurel wreath conferred on him by the Duke, and later by the state of depression caused by the covert sneers of Antonio. This and his lack of mental balance are the source of all the friction when he comes in contact with reality. He is the type of what the aesthetician Volkelt in another connection calls " Der Typus der dem Leben nicht gewachsenen Innerlichkeit." By comparing this play with another artist-tragedy, the *Sappho* of the Austrian poet Grillparzer, we see the difference between the sane mind and the unbalanced one. Sappho, the Greek poetess, falls in love with a simple youth who is incapable of understanding her. He, for his part, falls in love with a slave-girl, and they run away. Sappho has them brought back with the intention of punishing them, but she recognises that in stepping out of her ideal world in order to enjoy a material love, she is herself at fault. She had wanted to weave round her brow the wreaths both of Life and of Art, but Art and Life are not to be reconciled. Those whom the gods have chosen for their own must not consort with dwellers on the earth, and Sappho releases the lovers and hurls herself from the Tarpeian Rock. She

sees things with clearness of vision and is fully conscious of what she is doing, but Tasso never has a clear realisation of his attitude to his environment. Even when after mental agonies he clings to the "Verstandesmensch" Antonio as his only salvation, his apparent return to sanity is only temporary reaction and the drama ends in the middle.

Tasso's weakness of character comes to the surface chiefly in his quick change of mood from the height of joy to the depths of despair. "Himmelhoch jauchzend, zum Tode betrübt," as Egmont's Clärchen sings. He is cast down by the mere relation of Antonio's story of his Roman mission. That which he possesses soon appears to him worthless, and he esteems only that which he has not. After he has listened to the description of the mighty activities of the pope, that which is the basis of Tasso's whole existence, namely poetry, is made to appear futile in the eyes of the already irresolute poet.[20] He has not even faith in his own genius, but feels humiliated at being "only" a poet. He says repeatedly that he esteems the renown of great deeds higher than poetic fame, and is annoyed that the Duke does not come to him for advice. During his con-

versation with the Princess in Act V, he changes from the depths of gloom to the intoxication of joy. The princess wants him to moderate his ardour, but he has already lost control over himself and he embraces her. Immediately after his repulsion he is back again in his mad illusions, and has even intensified them. Even so he soon realises vaguely that he himself is the cause of all his suffering, and resigns himself to the consolation of his divine poetic gift.

" Und wenn der Mensch in seiner Qual
verstummt,
Gab mir ein Gott, zu sagen wie ich leide."

This was a support which Werther had not. Compare the poem " An Werther " in the " Trilogie der Leidenschaft "—

" Verstrickt in solche Qualen, halbverschuldet,
Geb' ihm ein Gott, zu sagen, was er duldet."

In spite of the untragic ending, there is no doubt that the tragedy is nevertheless inevitable. The truth is that Tasso's spiritual condition overshadows the practically negligible action in the way already explained in the case of Werther. Wounded honour and

hopeless love in the novel have a similar origin to the conflict with Antonio (leading to wounded vanity on his arrest) and hopeless love in the drama. Both have a keen sense of their intellectual superiority over the people round them, and wish to play a part in the world in accordance with their merits. In both cases we have two immediate motives that lead to the chief character's doom, but with Werther they spring from the disproportion between *dreams* and reality, with Tasso they spring from the disproportion between *genius* and reality. Tasso was a genius and therefore the disproportion was greater than in the case of Werther who was not. Werther, the gentle dreamy youth who shot himself, might have got over his Weltschmerz ; Tasso the genius, who remained alive, could never have rid himself of it. Goethe's biographer Bielschowsky remarks that those who fail to see that Tasso is saved, overlook the fact that Werther returns to the fatal spot and thus loses the opportunity of the activity which would have saved him, while Tasso leaves the Court and finds that which Werther lacks.[21] This point of view seems somewhat superficial, especially after he has himself admitted that

the love-motive is merely one expression of Tasso's sensitive nature. Separation from the princess might have cured his love, but between his soul and the world there was a gulf which not even time would completely bridge.

In the Weltschmerz characters of Goethe, the initial impulse is always given to the catastrophe by the appearance of some woman whom the hero is unable to renounce. He wavers between the extremes of joy and despair until the inevitable hopelessness of the reconcilement of desire and reality becomes apparent. If we look upon Tasso as being saved at the end of the play, then we must assume that he has realised the necessity for renouncing the princess; but Tasso differs from Werther in not being reflective and meditative. The latter had a vague philosophy of life, but Tasso hardly ever comes down to earth, and is incapable of coolly considering an ethical problem. As the princess tells him:

> " More and more
> The spirit strives to reconstruct within
> The golden age it fails to find without."

He lacks the sense of reality and especially the sense of proportion. He is a slave to his

imagination and his nerves and only quits his world of dreams under the impulse of a sudden access of joy or grief, or when impelled by some caprice.[22] Werther's sense of being misunderstood and isolated is here intensified to a veritable sense of persecution. Tasso in fact suffers from persecution mania; he believes himself the victim of a plot, and suspects those around him, even the object of his love, of perfidy, and his natural inclination towards solitude develops into distrust and suspicion. It is despair and not confidence which eventually drives him into the arms of Antonio, over his hatred of whom he had previously found fierce joy in brooding.

In a letter to Adolf Pichler on 11th May, 1851, the great dramatist Hebbel wrote with reference to Tasso, that the piece is nothing but the interesting history of the malady of a gifted being whose ethical development is incomplete, and who cannot be regarded as the type of the poetic temperament. This judgment, coming from a dramatist whose work *Tasso* to some extent foreshadows, is important as showing that Tasso is not a faithful picture of *the* poet, but only of *a* poet whose excess of imagination destroys his

sense of reality.[23] In the case of the average poet of great intellectual gifts, the power of literary creation would counterbalance and eventually conquer the weak yielding to the feelings, but Tasso is not normal ; his genius is already over the border-line. As in the case of Lenz, whose banishment from Weimar may have been caused by a similar " Eselei," as Goethe called it, and who eventually succumbed to insanity ; as in the case of Werther, who also precipitated the catastrophe by embracing Lotte in a moment of reckless abandon, —so Tasso seals his own fate by the outburst which was bound to come sooner or later. His power " zu sagen was ich leide " was of no use to the poet whose mind was almost unhinged ; it could be a temporary, but not a permanent consolation.

Tasso was conceived in 1780 and not completed until 1789, and it is probable that in the original version, the lost *Ur-Tasso*, the fate of the poet was nearer to that of Werther. In the final version, Antonio became the embodiment of an inner principle, the symbol of the sober world of reality into which Tasso could not fit himself ; the contrast in Goethe's own soul between the poetic and the prosaic

appears here not in the character of one man, but in two separate individuals, both symbols of widely different worlds, which the author himself was able to reconcile in his own breast. By idealizing the Duke, making the other characters noble and indulgent, and intensifying the Weltschmerz of Tasso, Goethe put the latter entirely in the wrong, and avoided the danger of providing an example for imitation to his young contemporaries, as he did in the case of Werther. It is interesting to note that in the second version of the latter novel, Goethe used similar means to bring into prominence the fevered, overstrained state of his hero.

Just as Werther has calmer moments when he decides to abandon his morbid self-introspection, so does Tasso promise no more to seek solitude and gloom :

" No more shall Tasso wander gloomily
In weakly solitude 'midst trees and men."

Nevertheless as the former remarks that it is his fate to be misunderstood, so does the latter complain :

" That is my fate,—towards me alone
Do all men change, who else are true and faithful
Towards other men."

We find in Tasso particular traits which are not to be seen in Werther, namely subservience to a master,[24] and a certain pathetic cunning, which expresses itself in the decision to mask his feelings towards the Court; the actual dissimulation is seen later.[25]

The words of Antonio:

"In youth he has already gained much more
Than he could frugally enjoy . . . . . .
. . . . . His discontent,
A mere caprice, lies cushioned on his fortune."

—suggest the question, whether Tasso would have been happy as an obscure person, like Werther. He wishes to impose upon the world, to be both looked up to as a poet, as he is, and consulted in affairs of state, as he is not. Even his love for the princess does not seem like the all-absorbing love of Werther, but rather to be part of his ambition. However I have answered this question above in imputing his fate to his general spiritual condition. The Duke hits the nail on the head when he says:

"Thy thoughts, thy actions—all do lead thee deep
Into thyself. Around us many a gulf

Lies dug by fate. But here within our hearts
There lies the deepest. *We are tempted sore*
To plunge within."

In spite of the Italian journey, *Tasso* remained an echo of the Werther period, the last of the Goethean Weltschmerzler.

STURM UND DRANG

J. M. R. LENZ

As, among the works of Goethe, Weltschmerz in its most pathological aspect is best seen in *Tasso*, so among the Sturm und Drang writers does Lenz, from whom Goethe borrowed traits for his Tasso, exhibit both in his works and in his private life the most unbalanced state of mind. He is the real Weltschmerzler of the revolutionary literary movement known as *Sturm und Drang*, or Storm and Stress.

It has already been seen above that titanism only becomes Weltschmerz, and in fact, must inevitably become so, when combined with weakness and inactivity of character. With the exception of Goethe and Schiller, in the lives of whom Sturm und Drang was only a phase, Lenz was the only real genius of this movement, and perhaps it was his very brilliance (combined, of course, with mental instability) that caused his eventual spiritual

ruin, as it is obvious that a mediocre spirit will be less prone to come to grief through Weltschmerz than a finely-strung and highly-gifted poet.

The disinclination to think logically, in other words, the subordination of the reason to the emotions, which was characteristic of the Stürmer und Dränger, resulted necessarily in a lack of ethical will. They did not believe in the absolute binding force of moral laws. They had no definite moral principles, and in the weakest type of Weltschmerzler this negative characteristic was replaced by instincts and moods, the latter being governed by an inherent sentimentality.

Even as a boy Lenz was given to brooding on death, and this inclination to melancholy was strengthened by the pietistic atmosphere of his home and the later influence of Young's *Night Thoughts*.[1] It can thus be said that even before he became a member of the Sturm und Drang movement, he was subject to the mild type of Weltschmerz such as we see in Miller's *Siegwart*, and in fact his heroes are more tainted with Weltschmerz than with Storm and Stress. Läuffer, in the drama *Der Hofmeister*, is an extraordinarily weak char-

acter. After he has seduced the girl to whom he is acting as tutor, his remorse leads him to castrate himself, an act which is possible, if at all, only to a spiritually and bodily impotent creature, while his subsequent decision to marry a peasant-girl renders him the most absurd character that has been produced even by the seventies of the eighteenth century. Stolzius, in *Die Soldaten*, when he hears that the officer Desportes is paying court to his sweetheart, threatens to throw himself into the water, and later on nearly becomes raving mad. The Waldbruder, in the novel of that name, falls in love with a young countess above his own rank, whom he has hardly seen, and promptly withdraws into the forest to brood.

Lenz himself possessed most of the characteristics that have been discussed in the previous chapter as peculiar to the Weltschmerzler. He was timorous and weak-willed, as witness his request to a brother-poet Klinger to accept responsibility for the authorship of *Die Soldaten*, lest the officers should seek revenge on the satirist.[2] He was fond of tormenting himself, and his four impossible love-affairs served as means to this end:—Friederike Brion, in whose

heart the memory of Goethe was ineradicably planted ; Cleophe Fibich, engaged to the elder von Kleist, Lenz's own pupil ; Goethe's sister Cornelia, who was already married ; and Henrietta von Waldner, a lady of high birth and already engaged. His own heart was his worst enemy, and even though he must have known in each case that his passion was hopeless, he appears to have made little or no attempt to fight against it. It almost seems indeed as though he chose the very love-affairs which would cause him the most torment. As with most Weltschmerz characters, it was a case where the erotic channel was the best and nearest outlet for the sensations pent up in his breast. His power of imagination governed his whole life, and even in his love-affairs there was a strange lack of reality. He always lived more in his fantasy than in real life. He treated the figments of his imagination as reality, and he looked at realities through the distorting mirror of his fantasy.

His propensity to self-torture is seen best in his confession *Moralische Bekehrung eines Poeten*.[3] He experienced a peculiar joy in laying bare his own demerits and imperfections,

but while he expressed disappointment with his own life and his unfulfilled expectations, he also hoped for amelioration and self-improvement. Lenz undoubtedly had the talent to achieve this end, had his reason attained the upper-hand of his emotions, but his sensitiveness was the cause of much of his suffering, though it was pain in which he could at the same time find an exquisite pleasure. In a letter to Lavater of May, 1775, he says : " My greatest sorrows are those which are occasioned by my own heart, *and yet, with all that, the most unendurable condition is when I am not suffering at all.* Perhaps all happiness is only a momentary rest which one takes in order to immerse oneself in new sorrows."[4] Elsewhere he says that solitude was the only balsam for his wound. All the stirrings of his bad conscience awoke and he revelled in his torment. Here is the same recognition of the brooding tendency and the pleasure to be derived from it, that we saw in the case of Werther. Lenz is unhappiest when he has nothing to brood on. The same faculty of torturing introspection is exhibited in Strephon, in *Die Freunde machen den Philosophen*, and in Robert in *Die Engländer*.

Lenz is one of the most subjective poets who ever lived, and a discussion of his heroes is therefore impossible without a consideration of the author. Unlike Goethe he did not wait for the happy moment when clarity of artistic vision would enable him to round off his creations, but he cast his experiences and sensations immediately into poetic form. The works of Lenz therefore mirror the man and his surging emotions more faithfully than do the works of Goethe. We can see this best by considering Lenz's most mature, and for the understanding of his attitude to life, most important work, *Der Waldbruder*.

The sub-title *Ein Pendant zu Werthers Leiden* was formerly thought to have been added either by Goethe, among whose papers the manuscript lay, or by Schiller, who published it in 1797 in *Die Horen*, but it was most probably appended by the author himself.[5] This does not mean to say that Lenz's novel is merely an imitation of *Werther*, though the latter undoubtedly influenced its form and style.[6] Whereas Werther's passion for Lotte impresses us forcibly with its human depth, the hermit's adoration for a woman he has hardly seen appears merely fantastic,

Lotte is beyond Werther's reach, because she is bound to another man, but as far as Herz is concerned, the object of his love, Stella, is only separated from him by the difference of station, as though she is betrothed, the fact is kept from him, and whereas Werther cannot keep away from the object of his worship, Herz retires to a cell to nurse his imagination, and feed his passion from afar.

Both Goethe and Lenz wrote in a state of extreme emotion, but the former for the sake of artistic completeness included motives which were not to be found in his own experience, while Lenz's work sprang directly from the dissonance of his own spirit, and the utterances of Herz can almost be looked on as confessions. This is rendered all the more striking by the fact that between Herz and Rothe, the friend to whom he addresses his letters, there is a sharp divergence of character, whereas Werther's friend Wilhelm is depicted as being in the main in agreement with him. The two elements of Werther's character, the contemplative or philosophical and the passionately emotional are in the Waldbruder divided between two characters, and here again we meet with the juxtaposition of

" Gefühlsmensch " and " Verstandesmensch," the man of feeling and the man of reason, that we have met with in all Goethe's earlier works. The picture of Rothe however, which is modelled on Goethe, with traits of Lavater, is coloured by the bitterness which Lenz felt towards his brother-poet, and he does not always appear to the best advantage when compared with the emotional hermit.

The action is more nebulous than in *Werther*, but there is an even greater power of self-observation. The way in which Lenz depicts the disturbance of his own spirit, his " lucidity in the midst of delirium "[7] is almost uncanny.[8] He seems at times clearly to recognise the pathological state of his hero, and thus of himself. The Werther-mood was not the only one by which Lenz was governed, but throughout his life he vacillated irresolutely between paroxysms of titanic idealism and melancholy depression, though strange to say, he also had the gift of considering dispassionately the various peculiarities of his own character, and analysed not only the Weltschmerzler Herz but also the man of the world Rothe. Both *Werther* and *Der Waldbruder* are protests against the conventional

trammels of society, but though the former is the more inactive character of the two, he is the one who eventually commits suicide. Prof. Max von Waldberg[9] says that even if Herz were in the more desperate condition of knowing that his loved one was betrothed, he would rather wait for the death of his rival than shoot himself. Prof. Erich Schmidt[10] on the other hand presumes that the fragment would have had a tragic ending. The long-lost *Briefe über die Moralität des jungen Werthers*, from which von Waldberg expected enlightenment, and which have only recently been discovered,[11] do not throw much light on the matter, as Lenz discusses not the moral aim which the poet has set himself, but the moral effect which the reading of the novel could and must have on the hearts of the public. Werther has a sound moral core, as Lenz recognises, when he says that the growing feeling of the impossibility of ever possessing Lotte, the sacred moral perception of the inviolability of the marriage tie, could alone screw the former up to his desperate resolve. It was only the fact that Lotte was married, and thus in Werther's eyes unattainable, that drove him to suicide. In the case of Herz the gulf is not

so wide, as he is unaware of Stella's betrothal and it is therefore unlikely that Lenz would have reserved for him this fate.[12] Eventual insanity is equally unlikely. Lenz says further that a Werther must have done and suffered much before he can begin to be a Werther. If we substitute Herz for Werther, it is hardly likely that the author would have represented as becoming insane a man who had " done and suffered much." Also as Herz is much more definitely Lenz than Werther is Goethe, both suicide and insanity can be ruled out as his final destiny. The assumption of von Waldberg is more probable, namely that the rival, Plettenberg, might give up his claim to Stella, or that as in *Die Freunde machen den Philosophen*, he might content himself with the name of husband, while Herz enjoyed the more material conjugal privileges. It is however improbable that Lenz would have provided the same solution twice. A similar moral obliquity is seen in Goethe's *Stella*, though reversed, one man standing between two women ; the revised version sought the solution in two suicides, but here again Goethe was more objective than Lenz was likely to be.[13]

As Herz at the end of the fragment becomes a soldier and is about to sail for America, is it not more than likely that Plettenberg was to meet a soldier's death and Herz come back with high rank and loaded with honours? Compare the concluding words of Plettenberg's last letter, the final words of the fragment:

"Friend, I notice by my grey hairs that I am getting old. Should Stella when I return, still older after the hardships of the campaign. . . . There are moments when it is dark in my soul, when I could wish. . . ."

These words seem to foreshadow an ending that may be favourable to Herz, and as the latter appears in a more sympathetic light than the pleasure-loving Rothe-Goethe, it is quite probable that Lenz intended to conduct his hero towards a happy conclusion of his romance, removing both obstacles at one blow.

Hand in hand with Lenz's colossal vanity goes a secret lack of self-reliance and disappointment in his own powers. The rapture of self-confidence alternates with outbursts of humility and self-abasement as in the poem "Uber die deutsche Dichtkunst":—

" Germany, poor Germany,
Art has thrust sickly stalks out of thy soil,
Feeble blossoms,

. . . . . .

And in the pod, when it grew,
Two grains of Genius :
When I write and. . . . . ."*

and the final verse

" And thou, my Genius . . . .

. . . . . .

Protect, faithful comrade of my life,
Protect my lonely grave,
That no glance from the realm of the blessed,
Of Shakespeare's burning eye,
Or the darkly-gleaming eye of Ossian,
Or the red-flashing eye of Homer,
May light upon it,
That my ashes may not turn in shame
That I too once ventured to write."

He hovers continually between two extreme moods, for his nature was made up of extremes and contradictions. In *Der Waldbruder*, *Die Freunde machen den Philosophen* and especially *Die moralische Bekehrung eines Poeten* he

* i.e. Goethe.

seems to take a morbid pleasure in exposing his failings, and his lyrics are pervaded by a mystic melancholy, which is epitomised in the lines :

" Loving, hating, striving, trembling,
Tortured and of hope bereft,
These can make existence bitter,
But without them,—what is left ? "

On the other hand, an attempt to deceive himself with a sense of his own self-sufficiency speaks out of the words of the Waldbruder : " To withdraw from the world, which knew me as little as I wished to know it—O what melancholy gratification lies in the thought. . . . . There is something in me that makes me insensible to all outward influences." And there is a Goethe-like Promethean ring in the lines :

" . . . . I cry Father, Saviour,
This heart must be filled,
Must be sated ; or else destroy
Thy image."

In *Der Waldbruder*, as in *Werther*, the outward appearance of Nature is always in accord with the mood of the hero, and we may perhaps regard this as a source of consolation for

him. This Rousseauism is seen in its pathological aspect in *Der Hofmeister*, where the old Major von Berg, when he imagines he sees his daughter, for whom he cherishes an exaggerated affection, pining away, indulges in an outburst against his philosophising brother —" Clear out of my house; let the whole world clear out. I will set it on fire, and take a spade and become a peasant." As his brother says: " I have never seen him so ecstatically melancholy."

Yet with all his failings, Lenz always retains his idealism, as when he complains of Rousseau's statement that man should not desire what it is beyond his powers to obtain. Lenz declares that he will rather remain weak and half-useless, than blunt his intellect for that which all the forces of Nature were set in motion to produce, and which Heaven itself reconciled all circumstances to perfect.[14] The words of Tasso, that a god gave him the power to say what he suffered, apply in equal degree to Lenz, and the parallel between this blighted genius and the hero of Goethe's drama holds good even to the extent that Lenz also suffered from the mania of persecution, and thought that his friends were plotting his ruin.

F. M. KLINGER

Whereas Lenz succumbed to his lack of resolution and the aimlessness of his life, Klinger, whose ideal had always been a military career, succeeded in rising above the storm and stress of his youth, and though he never really became reconciled to reality, his literary productions fall into two distinct periods, with the dividing line about the year 1780. In this chapter we shall only be concerned with the earlier period, during which he wrote dramas. The second period, that of his novels, will be dealt with later.

Klinger was urged on by a consuming ambition, and in his dramas he portrays characters whose restlessness and unbounded passion keep them ever on the move, without however leading to any definite, desirable goal. The nearest he gets to plumbing the depths of human passion is in the character of Guelfo, in the tragedy *Die Zwillinge*, who, like Tasso, believes that everybody is scheming against him. His dislike of his twin-brother turns to hatred when the latter becomes betrothed to the woman whom both of them love. He has also

persuaded himself that he is really the first-born, and by dint of brooding over his imagined wrongs, the stealing of his birthright and of the woman he loves, he is led to murder his brother. Yet though he always appears about to explode with the force of the emotions he cannot bottle up within him, the catastrophe yet comes as somewhat of a shock. Guelfo is undoubtedly on the borderline of madness, but his continual foaming and the very turbulence of his behaviour lead us to think that he will not after all go to extremes. The comparison with Tasso is illuminating. The latter also is perilously near to insanity, but it is the supersensitiveness of a genius, who is not a man of action, who dreams in the melancholy stillness of the study, and whose only danger is when he comes in contact with the sober actuality of the outside world. Guelfo is a pseudo-man of action, who could never be content to vegetate in a backwater of life, but who will never be anything more than a mediocrity because in spite of his inward urging he lacks the will to pursue a definite aim. Whereas in Goethe's *Faust*, for example, there is a titanic straining towards infinity, here there is merely a vague restlessness.

Klinger has given him an excellent foil in his friend Grimaldi, whose inertia and pessimism lead to Buddhistic thoughts of Nirvana.[15]

A further comparison that suggests itself is with the hero of Maler Müller's tragedy, *Golo und Genoveva*. One realises that Guelfo is hopeless from the start ; he is so concentrated on himself that no suspicion that he is in the wrong ever enters his head, and he never really feels remorse for his crime. In the case of Golo, who is much more of a Werther-character, there is a gradual crescendo of passion, as with Werther, Tasso and Lenz's hermit. Like Werther, he feels that his inclination to the woman he loves is wrong, and tries to go away, but does not, the demon in his breast keeping him near her, and again like Werther, the longer he stays the more irresistible grows his desire. Though it culminates in crime, however, Golo is sure of our sympathy, as we see the play of forces in his soul, hopeless passion, recognition of its hopelessness and criminality, desire to go away and fight it down, the weakness that keeps him chained to the spot and makes him a ready tool of his mother, the super-woman Mathilde, and finally remorse. Guelfo, on the other hand, is moved by one

single passion, the desire for power ; even his love seems unreal, and for lack of psychological development, he appears as a creature of untamed instincts, who intensifies his hypochondria by continual brooding.

If we compare the criminals of Lenz, such as Läuffer and Stolzius, we see what poor creatures these are. Of all the hero-criminals of the Sturm und Drang, Golo is the most sympathetic and Guelfo the most repellent.

Klinger was at bottom a sober nature, but though he had a stronger personality than Lenz, he was inferior as a poet, and had less power of depicting character. The element of morbidity in his temperament was due to his excessive adoration for Rousseau, who overshadowed his whole life and whom in his youth he regarded almost as a saint. In fact it appears that without Rousseau, the Sturm und Drang would have been an altogether healthier and saner movement and the passionate desire for personal freedom might have been directed into more practical channels. The idealism of Rousseau was responsible for the mistake, which history has always proved to be fatal, of endeavouring to produce a revolution in a hurry, in France the political

revolution, in Germany the earlier literary fermentation of the Sturm und Drang. Klinger's lack of balance, if he had pushed Rousseau into the background, would have been merely the irrepressibility of youthful energy, with its consequences of stormy passion and unlicensed ambition. That of Lenz was less tempestuous and more sentimental. The difference is seen in the characters of their dramas, those of Klinger being more dæmonic and extravagant, those of Lenz on the whole more human and in accord with actual experience.

Although Brand in *Das leidende Weib* and Otto in the play of the same name commit suicide, Klinger was too forceful a character to be sincere in his employment of this motive.[16]

Otto is a nobler nature than Brand, and he looks like a model for Schiller's Karl Moor, whose famous outburst " I loathe this ink-spilling century " is an echo of Otto's " That's what happens when one reads in idleness books that idle fellows have written."[17] The insanity of exaggerated egotism again comes to the fore, however, both in Otto and the Duke. The latter, because his son rises in revolt against him, says " Die Welt ist aus ihren

Schranken,"[18] which is reminiscent of Hamlet's "The times are out of joint." Because he himself is in trouble, he attributes a lack of cohesion to the whole world, and broods himself into a state of mental fever. Both Otto and Guelfo are tragedies of one-sided supermen.

In *Sturm und Drang*, the drama which gave its name to the whole literary movement, Klinger portrays himself in three separate characters: his lack of a definite *practical* ideal in Wild, his fantastic intoxication of feeling in La Feu, and his occasional discouragement and disillusionment in Blasius. His chief characteristic was, however, a desire for mighty deeds, no matter what deeds so long as they were on a great scale. As Mercury says in the pessimistic fragment *Der verbannte Göttersohn*: "The son of the gods begins to fret since he now has power neither to create nor to destroy."

J. A. LEISEWITZ

Like Goethe and Lenz, but in contrast to Klinger, Leisewitz gives the chief in rôle his tragedy *Julius von Tarent* to a weakling. As

befits the work of a member of the Göttinger Dichterbund, the lyrical and sentimental tone is prominent, and as befits a Stürmer und Dränger the atmosphere is that of Rousseau. Leisewitz himself was a vacillating, impatient, soul-sick character, and his literary output is small. His lack of faith in himself led to his ordering that the manuscripts he left behind should be burnt.

In the antagonism of the sentimental, brooding Julius and the active, tempestuous Guido we see again the old theme of the hostile brothers. The latter's contempt for book-learning and for delicacy of feeling re-echo later in Karl Moor, and the central motive appears both in *Die Räuber* and *Die Braut von Messina*. Leisewitz's play in fact was Schiller's favourite reading at the military academy, and a youthful drama, which he destroyed, called *Cosmus von Medicis* was an attempt at imitation.

In *Die Zwillinge* it was the turbulent younger brother who formed the psychological study, while the other was a shadowy figure. In Leisewitz' tragedy, it is this other, elder brother who comes to the fore. He has the same inclination to philosophic speculation as Werther had, and makes the same weak

endeavour to pull himself together[19] ; he has the same fondness for solitude, and even as a child he wore the languishing look of love before he knew what love was. The basis of Guelfo's discontent, however, was deepened by the unsolved doubt whether he was not the elder of the twins, and it was thanks to the impression made by this motive on the actor-manager Schröder, that Klinger's drama won the prize for which both he and Leisewitz competed. Like most of the Sturm und Drang poets, Leisewitz seemed to see the side of reason and incorporated it in the level-headed Aspermonte ; the seeming contradiction is accentuated by the fact that the Rousseauism of the play rings insincere. It is difficult to believe in the sincerity of this prince, who " gasps for freedom."[20] When, because he is in love with a girl who is beyond his reach, he declares that the international language of humanity is tears and sighs, and demands a field for his realm and the rippling waters of a brook for his exulting subjects, we suspect that like the old duke in Klinger's *Otto*, he is inclined to attach undue cosmic importance to his own troubles. He even stores up sentimental memories for use during future fits of brooding,[21]

in which respect he goes *consciously* further than any of the characters that have hitherto been discussed.

It is not possible to reckon on any influence of *Werther*, as the latter did not appear till after Leisewitz' tragedy was nearly finished.[22]

H. L. WAGNER AND MALER MULLER

Wagner was accused by Goethe, with but little justification, of having stolen the Faust-Gretchen theme from him to incorporate it in the tragedy *Die Kindesmörderin*. The hero, Gröningseck, is more like Clavigo than Faust, in that his good intentions never receive practical expression. He acts criminally towards the girl Eva, luring her to a house of ill-repute, for the purpose of seduction, and like Clavigo (who had not, however, acted so badly as Gröningseck) is overcome by remorse; in each case the penitent is subject to momentary changes of mood, which prevent him from coming to a definite decision before the catastrophe is precipitated. There is the difference that Gröningseck is really in love with Eva,[23] whereas Clavigo's later feeling

towards Marie was merely that of pity. Faust only desired Gretchen, but on the other hand neither he nor Clavigo went to the extent of attaining his end by violence as Gröningseck does. The greatest lack of moral sense is exhibited by the very man whose love is more than mere carnal desire. In this respect Gröningseck is more like Müller's Golo, though he has not the latter's sadistic frenzy in torturing the woman he loves. In *Golo und Genoveva* Müller describes the development from the rejected lover to the ruthless tyrant. The tragedy is founded on the well-known folk-story of the love of Golo for his master's wife. As she will not yield to him, he orders her to be murdered, but she is rescued and Golo meets his doom at the hands of his enemies. Golo is at first very like Werther, melancholy and unambitious, vague and undecided, changing quickly from despair to joy and again to despair. He is perhaps the most weak-willed of all the Sturm und Drang characters, and his ineptitude becomes all the more conspicuous because we see in him the Weltschmerzler in a position of high responsibility. His extraordinary self-pity and concentration on his ego are unparalleled else-

where. For example, he visits Genoveva in prison when she is in a position of the utmost misery, and accuses her of being cruel and unsympathetic towards him.[24] He even thinks it wrong of her to retain her virtue, as it makes him unhappy.[25] Werther had a firm moral basis to his character and that was why he committed suicide ; he saw no other way out. Golo shows the potentiality of a Weltschmerzler with unlimited power and moral blindness. None of the others went to the extent to which Golo is driven ; with all their lack of mental balance, none, except perhaps Klinger's Guelfo, reached the stage of insanity where he excused his moral obliquity simply on the ground that it was necessary to satisfy his own desires. Both Werther and Tasso were noble natures, whose love led them no further than to a harmless embrace in a moment of uncontrollable ardour. Even Guelfo had an honest belief that his birthright had been stolen from him. Tasso was on the verge of harmless insanity and paranoia, but Golo is on the way to becoming a sadistic tyrant. Yet in spite of this, the skill with which his psychological development is represented, the fact that his love for Genoveva is more than sensual, and

the lyrical and elegiac note which the poet has added by means of the poem " Mein Grab sei unter Weiden " that runs like a theme through the whole piece, assure him, on the whole, of our sympathy. Among minor Shakespearean reminiscences in the tragedy, Golo bears a great resemblance to Macbeth, without the latter's strength of character, just as Mathilde resembles Lady Macbeth without her remorse.[26]

It is curious that in this play the reasoning instinct which acts as a counterbalance and practical guide to the emotion is personified in a woman—a super-woman. Mathilde, who is Golo's mother, steadies his wavering purpose, but goes further than any other " Verstandesmensch " we have met in driving him from one crime to another. She recognises his weakness, always between wanting and not-wanting, between desire and fear, and plays with skill upon his emotions until he lets himself be swayed by her entirely, though, to be sure, when she is on her death-bed he refuses to go and see her to console her last moments. When away from her influence, his remorse always gets the upper hand and the better side of him struggles to the light. Without her he

would never have gone further than Werther, not because, like the latter, his moral sense forbade, but because without some outside influence urging him on he had not the strength to translate his desires into fulfilment by criminal means, even though his authority was supreme. Mathilde is an intensified Adelheid, the super-woman of Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen*, and she exercises a similar influence over a weakling. Both Weislingen and Golo allow their conscience to be suppressed; both prepare to go away and yet allow themselves to be held back at the last moment. It is characteristic of the hypnotic influence of Mathilde and the extent to which she overshadows the piece, that it is she, and not Golo, who gives utterance to the usual contempt for erudition.

Müller's *Faust* is a strange combination of Promethean defiance and base desire. He wishes chiefly for possession and enjoyment and his ideal eventually turns out to be gratification of the sensual appetites. His goal is vague and there is no high spiritual impulse to drive him to the pact. It would be unfair to Müller however, not to insist on the elements of titanism in Faust, though the lack

of plastic form causes these elements to appear as isolated features. He wants to plan out his own fate, " in defiance of the capricious Thing that governs this world," for, as he says to one of the devils, man desires more than either God or devil can give him.

A " lion of insatiability " roars within him and his soul has an unappeasable hunger that tries to lift him from the base tumult. All this vague desire remains unsatisfied because his power to fulfil is unequal to it, but when the *deus ex machina* in the person of Mephisto arrives, his high ideals turn out to be very tawdry after all. In the final scene, when Mephisto offers him the choice of returning to his former state, Faust refuses to take the chance, as the alternative is humiliation in the eyes of the woman he loves. The ethical will is entirely lacking and he goes out weeping : " Alas ! Unhappy is he who plays with devils."

A much more interesting figure is really Mephisto, who is also a titan. He feels the sublime possibilities of the human spirit and is tormented by the thought of the ruin he has to cause. Himself a fallen angel, he has sympathy and admiration for the Promethean

nature, created to be Seraph or devil. The seeds of both Faust and Mephisto lay in Müller himself, but they were rendered barren by the curse of his generation.

GÖTTINGER DICHTERBUND

The difference between the literary school known as the *Göttinger Dichterbund* and the Sturm und Drang is epitomised in the fact that the former was satisfied to find expression chiefly in the lyric, while the latter could not compress its more violent personality within such narrow limits, but chose rather the form which was more adapted to the expression of restless striving and stormy passions, namely the drama. It is true that in many respects the two currents cross, and a line of strict partition cannot be drawn. Leisewitz, for example, can be considered as a member of both movements. Nevertheless if we take the extremes of both, Klinger on the one hand, J. M. Miller on the other, it will be seen what an apparently tremendous gulf separates Guelfo from Siegwart, though if we proceed by the easy stages of Siegwart, Werther, Tasso, Golo, Guelfo, the distance is not so great after all.

The chief members of the Bund whose works present us with keys to the study of Weltschmerz are J. M. Miller and Ludwig Hölty, and we may also deal with Friedrich von Matthisson. They were all simple pious souls, of the type that we should call sentimental; none of them had much passion in his nature, but they all exhibit the morbidity which is rarely absent from the most superficial sentimentality, and which constitutes its dangerous aspect.

Miller is chiefly known as the author of *Siegwart, eine Klostergeschichte,* which was inspired, if the word is not too strong, by *Werther,* but exhibits at its height the type of Weltschmerz which may be called harmless, in that it is incapable of actively harming anybody other than the one who is subject to it. Siegwart is thwarted in his love for his sweetheart, who is eventually hidden away in a convent by her relations. He believes her dead and becomes a monk. One day he is called to the convent to attend to a nun who is dying, and whom he finds to be no other than his Marianne. She dies, Siegwart falls ill, and one morning he is found dead in the pale moonlight on her grave.

There is no bitter pessimism, merely melan-

choly " Schwärmerei." Graveyard thoughts, love of solitude, the " joy of grief," vague yearnings for a better world of harps and angels and the inevitable apostrophes to the moon, which here even sheds tears, form the background for a love-story which lacks the deep roots of heroic tragedy, and whose catastrophe constitutes to that of *Werther* the same contrast that a faded flower does to a tree that has been uprooted by a storm.[1] There is hardly a page where somebody, or even something, does not weep. By the side of Siegwart who falls back into a weakling piety, the pagan Werther appears almost distinguished by strength of character. The gulf that separates the lovers is not so wide, but Siegwart does not resist his moods, and allows himself to be swept on by circumstances instead of making an effort to fashion his life according to his ideals.[2] There is no passionate force, only renunciation. The fact that the generation in which this novel appeared was inclined to place it on a higher level than *Werther*, is of real importance for the understanding of the psychology of the tearful '70's and '80's. The word " siegwartisieren " which is used by Anton Reiser[3] is significant in that

it shows how Siegwart, who became the model for a flood of sentimental stories of monastic life, was looked upon as a type. This is the more strange as Miller was a poet who was infected rather by the emotions of others than moved by those which sprang from his own temperament. Most of his lyrics were written in the years 1772 to 1776, the latter the year of *Siegwart*, and he survived his fame by over thirty years. In his lyrics he pours out the same tearful laments in the same effeminate way as in his novels. Perhaps his extraordinary vogue is to be explained by the remark of Otto von Leixner, who says "This sickly-sweet tearfulness was the Sturm und Drang of German philistinism, which characterised then as now the great majority of the German people."[4]

A similar melancholy, but less tearful and more sincere, pervades the lyrics of Hölty, who died at the age of twenty-eight, after a life of sickness, in the year in which *Siegwart* was published.[5] The key-note of his poetry is a presentiment of coming death, and the atmosphere is tranquilly elegiac. Nature is glorified in a pious, sentimental way and provides him with matter for melancholy meditation and a

certain consolation in his broodings. His friend Miller wrote his obituary and unconsciously pointed out the difference between his own writings and those of Hölty. The effect which Hölty produces on his reader, he says, " is that which is produced by the evening twilight ; a melancholy tranquillity which borders on tears."[6] The tears are very near to the surface, and that is the fascination of Hölty's poetry. They do not come forth in an overwhelming flood to drown the reader, as in Miller's effusions.

The erotic impulse is present only in the form of a longing for love, as there was no one in Hölty's life on whom to focus it, and the substitute had therefore to be found in daydreams. Had Hölty lived he would never have become a Siegwart, but might have become a Werther, though it is of course difficult to say to what extent his state of mind originated in his physical condition, or whether the latter merely accentuated the former.

The longing which Matthisson breathes into his poetry is mainly religious. It is a yearning for Heaven, and a desire to cast off earthly thoughts. While waiting for the day of relief,

he flies to Nature as a refuge from the conflict of life and pours out his soul in lamentations. He continues the tradition of Hölty, but has more resemblance to Miller. His earliest poems were written between 1777 and '78, and first published in 1781, but it was only with the second edition of 1783, the year when Hölty's collected poems were first published, that they attained their popularity owing to the favourable review of Schiller. It is difficult to understand how the latter could have lavished such extravagant praise on such a weakling poet. *Die Räuber* had appeared two years before, but what a difference between the thunderings of Karl Moor against the degenerate century and the plaintive laments of Matthisson! It is true that Schiller concerns himself chiefly with Matthisson's power of landscape painting, and he explains why Nature appeals to the melancholy soul. "In the tumult of the busy world, there is in our minds a constant supplanting of one picture by another, and the diversity of our being is in this case not always our gain; all the more faithfully does simple, consistent Nature around us preserve the emotions of which we make her the confidante, and in her eternal unity we find our own

again.'" Thus, as was the case with Hölty, Nature was the half-way house to Heaven. The latter could not be attained until the earthly fetters were cast off, so the next best thing was to seek its reflection in Nature. It was the only way in which these pious souls could estrange themselves from the world, as they had not that intense and fiery imagination which provided a private stage and temporary oblivion to Weltschmerzler of stronger fibre. The erotically significant "yearning," which in Matthisson found its outlet in religion, is perhaps the basis both of the religious hysteria which develops into fanaticism, and of the philistinism which seeks the realisation of its ideals in the suppression of such longings as have their origin in man's physical nature. Matthisson's vogue outlasted the century, but he was vigorously attacked in the year 1800 by the Romanticist A. W. Schlegel, who five years previously had had only words of praise.

An allied nature was his friend Gaudenz von Salis-Seewis, whose languishing melancholy is however tempered by a somewhat deeper emotion, expressed in less misty terms. Salis was on the whole rather more manly than Matthisson.

K. P. MORITZ

The first fragment of Moritz' most important work, *Anton Reiser*, was printed in the " Berlinische Monatsschrift " in 1783, and the first part was published in 1785, while the fourth and last part was not published until 1790. In this " psychological novel," as Moritz calls it, there is an attempt to analyse with the most minute detail the emotions, thoughts and ambitions of a highly-gifted but overstrung youth during the first twenty years of his life. The period dealt with is from 1756 to the beginning of 1777, but as Anton Reiser is Moritz himself, we are perhaps justified in concluding that the experiences of those early years are considered and expounded by the author in the light of the psychological knowledge he possessed when he was writing the book in maturer years. In any case the autobiography is the most valuable work of the eighteenth century, not even excepting

Werther, for the study of Weltschmerz, the conditions which fostered it and the temperaments which were most subject to it.

Brought up in a Quietist family, where the perfect state is sought in complete passivity of the spirit, Reiser hovers always between an intensity of introspection which amounts to self-torture and the utter annihilation of his spiritual life. On one occasion after experiencing the greenest envy of a school-mate, he becomes annoyed with himself for feeling like that and is discontented at his own discontent. Every stirring of his soul is analysed and brooded over ; none is too trivial. On the other hand, after a vain attempt to write poetry, he locks himself in his room, lies down on his bed a-wearied with life and falls into a state of lethargy which lasts for days. His reading becomes a necessity to him and he uses it as an opiate to drug himself into oblivion, but everything he does to tear himself from the outward world merely deadens the inward pain, and does not cure it. The contempt everybody feels for him when he is at the high school and visits his *Freitische**

* The *Freitisch* was the free board accorded to poor students by citizens of the town. Anton Reiser was thus helped by seven different families, one for every day in the week.

gives him good cause to think the world against him and leads him to despise himself, but this, after all, is only another aspect of the spiritual annihilation in which he so frequently indulges. The root of the whole trouble is an acuteness of imagination, which enables him to blind himself to his environment and live in a fanciful world of his own, a dangerous gift which, if indulged in to excess, eventually distorts the reflection of the actual world and leads inevitably to madness, as was seen in the case of Tasso. The latter's fantasy was less crude and more artistic, but equally inclined to hysteria. It is not impossible that Moritz, who stayed with Goethe in Weimar in December 1788, when the latter was working at the second and third acts of *Tasso*, provided him with some slight psychological data for his drama.[1] Like Tasso, Reiser broods over imaginary wrongs and a sense of being misunderstood. The whole of his emotional life is directed inwards, so that he lives almost wholly in his own ideal world and drinks deep of the "joy of grief." After listening to a particularly touching sermon, he declares that probably nobody has experienced the joy of grief more deeply on such an occasion than he.

Such a convulsion of the soul, he says, was worth more to him than any other pleasure life has to offer, and he would have given food and sleep for it.[2] On one occasion he even feels a sort of masochistic joy in doing the most menial work. Often the greatest joy makes Moritz sad and the bitterest grief makes him cheerful, because when he experiences any pleasure, he cannot resist the thought that perhaps that is all he has to hope for from life. When however he sees that the purest and most innocent joys are embittered by adverse contingencies, he thinks " this cannot be the final purpose of my life. These joys are by no means what I wished and which my heart announced to me."[3]

The extraordinary thing is that in spite of this world of dreams, which is to him more than the material world around him, Moritz is yet able to bring to bear on his most inward heart an intellectual searchlight which leaves nothing in shadow. The depths of his subconsciousness are brought into the light, and Moritz can sometimes get outside himself and look at himself as though he were a stranger. This latter is something that Werther could not do, but which is also a characteristic of

Jacobi's Woldemar. It was of course the Moritz of 1785-90 who was looking at the Moritz of 1756-77, but that detracts very little from the marvellousness of the feat. The faculty of *distance* is a masculine quality which is not often to be found in the Weltschmerzler, whose self-insufficiency, or moral dependence on an idea or another person, is an essentially feminine characteristic. That is why nearly every one of the characters we have discussed is provided with a foil in the shape of the level-headed "Verstandesmensch," and when the latter is a woman as in the case of Mathilde (*Golo und Genoveva*), then she is more masculine than the man.

In this connection it may be well to mention that *Anton Reiser* is the only book under review, from which the erotic motive is entirely absent. Reiser reaches the age of twenty without ever having been in love or having experienced the slightest sentimental emotion towards a member of the opposite sex. Only once, towards the end of the book, is there any mention of his feeling the necessity for some one to love, since his despair has changed to sympathy with his own condition, and there is no one to feel this sympathy for him. Nothing

could be more convincing of the secondary nature of the love-motive in a story of Weltschmerz than the experience of Anton Reiser. Although he sees himself in Werther, with his thoughts and emotions, it is only with a great effort that he is able to enter into the love situations. The erotic channel is merely the nearest and most natural outlet for the emotions. This is not to say, however, that the sex impulse may not have a great deal to do with the origin of Weltschmerz—in fact, if the subject were deeply probed by the psycho-pathologist, sex probably would be found at the root of it. It is also most probable that this very lack of the sexual outlet in the case of Reiser is the cause of the terrible intensity of his morbid inclinations. As with all Weltschmerzler, Reiser's keenness of imagination feeds his vanity and his spells of self-admiration are more frequent than his spells of self-contempt. He goes so far as to indulge in little theatrical flights of fancy, and pretends to himself that a gentleman will notice something striking about him in the street and use his interest on his behalf. As he thinks that a sad cast of countenance will help matters, he affects an even more melancholy look than is habitual

to him. Even his day-dreams are cast in theatrical mould, and once, after he has almost made up his mind to go to Weimar to act as servant to the author of *The Sorrows of Werther*, he will not go home to his lodgings, where he has been given notice to leave, but wanders about all night in the rain. The phrase in *King Lear* occurs to him, "to shut me out, in such a night as this," and in his despair, he seeks oblivion by playing through the rôle of Lear in his mind. In this way he once more revels in the joy of grief until even this feeling becomes dulled and nothing remains but empty reality, so that he bursts into a peal of laughter in mockery of himself. On one of his journeys he is very near the verge of insanity. He gives confused answers to enquiries as to who he is, and makes up a story which he actually believes himself, although there is not a word of truth in it. "Estranged from the world of reality, the barrier between dream and truth threatened to collapse." Werther found subject for self-pity in his theatrical imaginings, but he never consciously posed as Reiser does.

At the bottom of his playing at pretence, however, there lies a certain idealism and

ambition which refuse to let him think that he will always be misunderstood and neglected, and it is this driving force which occasionally gives him the positive contact with his environment that keeps him on this side of the border-line. From his earliest days he has a thirst for knowledge and an intense desire to go to school. There are few more pathetic episodes in literature than the description of the boy Reiser, who has been taken away from school by his father and sent to Brunswick as a hat-maker's assistant, watching the boys coming out of school and envying their happier fate in receiving the education for which he longs with all his soul. There is nothing titanic about Reiser, no consuming desire for an active life, however aimless, which would mark him as a son of the Sturm und Drang. Like Werther he combines extreme emotional activity with almost equally extreme outward passivity. Any jar to his pride or sensitiveness causes him to draw back again into his shell, as he has not sufficient confidence in himself to stand by his own conviction, and his eternal fanciful vanity incites him to lay more weight on appearances than on reality. The suppression of his self-

consciousness to which he has been subjected since childhood prevents him from being able to ignore the opinions of others. The natural consequence is to foster an inclination for solitude which in turn leads to misanthropy, and even a desire for death as a relief from his tortures. For days together he plans how to live as a peasant, without stirring a finger to translate his fancy into reality; he begins rather to find pleasure in the fancy itself, and then, after imagining himself a peasant, he thinks that after all he is destined for something better and finds a renewed source of pleasure in a kind of self-pity.

We have seen that the essential character of the idealism of the Weltschmerzler is that it is vague and aimless. It is a shore on which he can find no firm footing, so that Reiser's striving is always timorous and uncertain, and from this comes the inclination to solitude, the restless nightly wanderings, and the weak flight into the world of fantastic and theatrical dreams.

Something new in Reiser is a pronounced disposition to Pessimism. Werther did not draw a philosophy from his troubles, but was content to chew the cud of his emotions. The

Night Thoughts of Edward Young which come into his hands, find Reiser in the proper frame of mind to appreciate them. He says that it seemed to him as though he re-discovered in them all his previous conceptions of the futility of life and of the vanity of all human things. And later he declares that the thought of dissolution, of the entire forgetting of self, of the cessation of all memory and all consciousness was sweet to him. This is a Buddhistic doubt of the worth-whileness of things and a desire for Nirvana, which we do not again meet with until the next century. When he sees the signs of cheerful family life in the lighted windows, he is prompt to draw a pessimistic philosophic conclusion, that among so many thousands who are and have been, he is only one. That strange, shadowy figure from Klinger's *Zwillinge*, Grimaldi, seems to speak again with his " ein herrlicher Gedanke durchzittert mich—nicht zu seyn," and the parallel is the more striking as Grimaldi also spends much of his time in a state of inertia.

When Reiser sees *Die Zwillinge* on the stage, the effect produced on his emotions is extraordinarily violent. " Guelfo believed himself

to have been repressed from the cradle—so did he." He finds himself again in Guelfo, and the bitter laughter with which the latter mocks himself in his despair, reminds Reiser of desperate moments when he has himself done the same thing. The self-repulsion felt by Guelfo when he smashes the mirror in which he sees himself after the murder of his brother, and his desire *for nothing but sleep*, appear to Reiser such a true reflection of his own soul that he for a time lives himself into the part, indulging at the same time his theatricality, his self-contempt, his inclination to spiritual drugging and the joy of grief.

In spite of this world-weariness, there is a strong animal instinct of self-preservation. As an animal he wishes to live ; as a human being, every moment of existence is intolerable. Again and again when the reader thinks that Reiser must surely now have reached the limit of human endurance, and that either suicide or madness is the only possible issue, there comes some healthy instinct or characteristic which saves him. There is no man of the world to give him the advice which the Weltschmerzler never takes, unless to some extent it is in accord with and helps to further

his own desires. His friend and namesake Philipp Reiser is a hothead, continually wrapped up in his own erotic adventures, for which Anton shows not the slightest understanding. His vanity and his self-contempt balance each other. The very pleasure he draws from his sorrows helps to save him, though it did not save Werther, but then the latter had come up against a definite, concrete obstacle which there was no getting over, and the erotic wave eventually overwhelmed him. Most of the disappointments and disillusionments which Reiser encounters have their source in his own vanity, just as the love of the Weltschmerzler is rooted in vanity, but the absence of the erotic influence saves him from the supreme folly. One might almost conclude that no Weltschmerzler would put an end to his own life, unless he fell in love with a woman who is beyond his reach. It was noticed that Werther's passion increased after Lotte was married, and is it possible that Goethe was really in love with Lotte Buff when the expression on paper of his emotions was sufficient to sober him? Moritz says that every finished work of art would probably have destroyed its author, if it had not been able to

evolve itself out of his spirit.[4] Moritz thus formulates his theory of the pathological disposition of the artist, and has come very near to probing the temperament of the Weltschmerzler. Many an attack of Weltschmerz has its genesis in a lack of creative power, and Moritz was illustrating the theory that artistic creation acts as a self-cure of a developing neurosis. Goethe saved himself by his power of self-expression, i.e. (in the language of psycho-analysis) he cured the neurosis which was arising from the repression of his love for Lotte. But if that love had been the passion that moves heaven and earth, no amount of " confession " would have eradicated it. The erotic impulse of the Weltschmerzler, focussed on a definite love-object, can pass off harmlessly unless there is an insuperable obstacle in the way of fulfilment. In the latter case the impulse strikes back to inflame the vanity of the lover, and festers until it eats ever deeper into the soul. From this Reiser is redeemed, though we have seen that his inability to give artistic expression to his other emotional experiences is the cause of occasional pathological manifestations.

It is probably owing to the above-mentioned

inability to understand the love-motive that Reiser finds *Siegwart* boring. A year before the publication of Miller's sentimental novel, Reiser is in the habit of going out in the evening to " siegwartisieren " as he calls it, in the moonlight, but when it appears, he and his friend have the utmost difficulty in enduring the appalling ennui of remaining in the same state of lachrymose emotion throughout the three volumes. Reiser is no Siegwart. His inner life is deeper and much more varied, his ambitions are stronger, and Siegwart's tender " Schwärmerei " for Marianne is as incomprehensible to him as Werther's passion for Lotte.

We thus see that Moritz both looks backward and looks forward. He vacillates between Pietism and free-thinking, and between the influences of the " Aufklärung " and those of the " Geniezeit." In an age of keen self-observation, he surpasses all his fellows in the intensity and complexity of his morbid introspection. Nobody shows such a complete estrangement from the plane of reality, and by analysing the confused, diverging elements of his character, he only succeeds in making them still more intricate and bewildering. The continual

thinking of himself which we saw in Werther, has developed in Moritz into a complex fantasy which degenerates eventually into mental play-acting, until even this palls, and estrangement from reality is followed by estrangement from his own imagination and drugging of his mental activity.

A man like Moritz needs, in order to be happy, to be able to assert the right of his complicated nature to existence, and not to regard it as abnormal.[5] He was unfortunately too compliant to the influence of others and always ready to yield to wishes which ran contrary to his own. Hence the spells of self-contempt, the danger of which he explains himself in his *Beiträge zur Philosophie des Lebens*, which was published before *Anton Reiser*, in 1780. He who despises himself, he says, is incapable of any noble achievement. At the time when Moritz was writing his autobiography, the heyday of Sturm und Drang had passed and there was no burning literary conflict which might have roused him to activity. Whenever a resistless desire for change overcame him, he could only satisfy it by long aimless wanderings. The "Wanderlust" which never left him is a symbol of his

own life. His one great ambition, to become an actor, was denied him, and for the rest of his life he let himself be carried whither whim or chance might take him.

Of all Goethe's characters the one whom Reiser most resembles is Tasso. In addition to the resemblances which have already been indicated, they were both easily moved from hope to despair, and from despair to hope. Reiser even draws at first some slight consolation from his skill in making verses, until he realises that he is unable to rise to higher flights. There are many other mutual characteristics, which are however common to all Weltschmerzler. Of actual authors, Moritz' temperament was most akin to that of Lenz. They both possessed real genius, which was in each case sterilized by lack of a definite ideal or a clear ethical purpose. Lenz was more of a Weltschmerzler than any of the Sturm und Drang writers, and Moritz was the most morbid Weltschmerzler of them all, while they were two of the most subjective writers in the history of literature. They alternated between self-confidence and self-abasement but always retained a certain idealism. Moritz however had less creative ability and was

irretrievably affected by the mystic religious upbringing of his youth.

Moritz anticipates the future in two ways. His preference for a vague, imaginative world of shadowy outlines and his love of things ancient and hoary ruins anticipate the era of Romanticism. The pessimistic philosophy at which he arrives in his worst moments seems to show that the philosophy of Schopenhauer is to be traced back to Weltschmerz, which was at first only a state of the psyche, but eventually developed into a systematic outlook on life.

JUNG-STILLING

There are two other autobiographies which suggest comparison with *Anton Reiser*, namely *Heinrich Stillings Leben* and Hippel's *Lebensläufe nach aufsteigender Linie.*

Johann Heinrich Jung, called Jung-Stilling, was sixteen years older than Moritz, having been born in 1740, but he did not enter the University till the age of thirty. He was thus a student at Strassburg at the same time as Goethe, with whom he dined at the same "mensa," and to whom in the year 1774 he gave the manuscript of *Heinrich Stillings Jugend.* This was published by Goethe three years later in 1777, and in the following year the author himself published the continuations *Heinrich Stillings Jünglingsjahre* and *Wanderschaft.* These three are the only portions of the autobiography which will concern us here.[1]

Stilling has many qualities in common with Reiser, but is a much less complex character.

In both cases there is the Pietistic upbringing, the effects of which Reiser tried at times to shake off, but which always formed the background in the tragedy of his life. Stilling reconciles himself to it, and a blind trust in Providence is the mainspring of his life. He accepts money from his friends with no prospect of being able to return it, allowing them to think that he is expecting a remittance. He has no moral backbone, but as a substitute a passive trust in God, and it is in this that he finds the consolation which Reiser sought in his imagination. This is a fundamental difference between the two. The latter analyses every facet of his imagination, the former every stirring of his pious emotion. In this way Stilling's vanity takes the form of believing that he is a favourite of Providence, and that an emotional life such as his is granted to few. Stilling is at bottom another Siegwart, almost equally tearful, though somewhat more passionate in his tears. His mother Dortchen again is a Siegwart translated into the feminine sphere, and the description of her might have been taken bodily from a novel by Miller. She continually indulges in the joy of grief. When there is a

beautiful sunrise, she gazes at it thoughtfully and weeps ; when the sun sets, she also weeps, but nothing affects her so deeply as the moon. Stilling does not go so far in the joy of grief as to revel in self-abasement, as Reiser did at times, but his mental life is a continual submission to fate, so that at last he does hardly anything on his own initiative. He has the same thirst for knowledge that Reiser had, but suffers from lack of confidence in himself. When offered a good post he allows himself to be persuaded to refuse it, as he cannot trust himself to withstand the temptation to live above his station. On another occasion he finds happiness as a working tailor, and all ambition dies. It is his firm intention to remain a tailor until he is assured that it is the will of God that he should do something else, and his desire for knowledge ceases to become a passion. Later, when he receives "a sign from God," he accepts a position as a private tutor, and the thought of studying, which lies latent at the back of his mind, again occurs to him. It is in this *conscious* inactivity, which he makes the guiding principle of his life, that Stilling is essentially different from other Weltschmerz-

ler. He finds an excuse for his weakness of character in a kind of fatalism.[2] It is to be noted that this is not pessimism, but rather the opposite ; Stilling anticipates Mr. Micawber and is always waiting for something to turn up. He does nevertheless sometimes come to the verge of despair, and dally with thoughts of suicide. The description of the terrible nervous attack, which nearly unhinged his mind during one particularly unhappy period of his life, is almost grotesque. All day long he was taciturn and reserved, but as soon as he went to bed the tears began to flow, " and when he was in bed he struggled with his hellish torment, until the whole bed and even the window panes rattled until he fell asleep." His hysterical disposition displays itself on another occasion in an equally grotesque manner when he discovers that he has come among pious people ; he begins without the slightest warning to weep and to cry out " O God, I'm at home, I'm at home ! " A man who could put these reminiscences into print in cold blood was not likely to commit suicide. For a Werther, who could not find complete consolation in faith like Stilling, or in imagination like Reiser, that was the line

of least resistance, but for a Stilling it was easier to sit down and wait for a sign from above. We have seen what a terrible impression the slightest snub from a superior had on Anton Reiser, who felt his self-esteem crushed by thoughtless brutality. Stilling has but little self-esteem that is capable of injury; when he loses his post again and again through no fault of his own he becomes melancholy, and that is all; he does not rave against the fates.

In Stilling's life, as in that of Anton Reiser, there is no erotic impulse to drive the story along. Stilling's attitude towards the opposite sex is that of sympathetic interest, but not love, and it is significant that it is his wife who takes the initiative in informing him of "the very lively impression" that has been made upon her heart. Stilling merely agrees that this impression must be the will of God, and with that their engagement is sealed. Later on, in choosing his second wife, he repudiates even the negligible quantity of sexual emotion that was present when he was himself chosen by his first wife, and solemnly affirms that Heaven only assists at marriages of reason and not at marriages of love.

Taking him all in all, Jung-Stilling belongs to the pre-Werther period, and stands firmly rooted in the sterilised soil of Pietism, which nearly paralysed his faculties and turned a gifted youth into a sentimental philistine. Anton Reiser draws one along with an intense interest and sympathy, but the story of Stilling's life lacks the tragic conflict of the soul which alone could raise it from the ranks of the mediocre.

T. G. von HIPPEL

The *Lebensläufe nach aufsteigender Linie* by Theodor Gottlieb von Hippel were designed to depict first of all the author's own life, then his father's and finally that of his grandfather. The work however did not exceed the four volumes (containing over two thousand pages) which were published in the years 1778 to 1781, and whose hero is Hippel himself. Crammed with maxims and precepts, with frequent digressions interrupting the thread of the story for pages at a time, the book is written in a style which anticipates that of Jean Paul.[1]

Hippel is perhaps the most contradictory character of the eighteenth century. In his practical life he rose from humble circumstances to be the civic head of the town of Königsberg, where he put down official abuses with an iron hand. In his treatise *Über die Ehe* he entered the lists against celibacy, though he himself remained a bachelor, and

in a subsequent pamphlet *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Weiber*, which was not published till 1792, he demanded complete equality of the sexes and the participation of women in public life. In spite however of his apparent objectivity of outlook and active spirit, Hippel was looked upon even by his friends as a contradictory eccentric. The *Lebensläufe*, the authorship of which was kept secret until after Hippel's death, reflect little or nothing of the man of action, but are in some respects a parallel to *Siegwart*. There is the same morbid graveyard tendency, which here reaches its zenith, combined with a trust in divine providence and pietistic ecstasy such as we see in Jung-Stilling. Hippel was less moved by *Werther* than he was by *Siegwart*, in whose unhappy love-affair he recognised a similarity to an episode in his own career, when he had to renounce the girl with whom he was in love. This actual occurrence is reflected in the *Lebensläufe* in the tragedy of Minchen and Alexander, which again bears some resemblance to that of Marianne and Siegwart.

In Hippel's career there was a decided striving for a definite aim in life, but there is

little of this in the book, and the explanation is that Hippel had a dual nature ; on the one hand, an outward delight in life and adherence to practical maxims of moral conduct, on the other, an idealism which took refuge in melancholy solitude and exile from the plane of reality. The issue of the conflict however was not tragic, because Hippel was able to express the one side of his nature in his busy public life, and to find an outlet for the other in his writings. The two cannot be reconciled. Faust endeavoured to forget the second by drinking life to the dregs, but Hippel was content to keep to the standards of respectability and restrain, as far as he could, the rebellious side of his nature to his mental experiences, finding at the same time a certain relief in literary expression. An important factor in his salvation was a sense of humour, which found material in the painful contrast between the ideal and the actual—an aspect of the " joy of grief " which is here seen for the first time, but which was to be common enough in the nineteenth century.

A point of contact between Hippel's life and his writings is to be found in the extreme sensuality which found expression in both.

This feature distinguishes him from Moritz and Jung-Stilling, and the practical satisfaction of his eroticism, which was not, with the exception of his early unfortunate love-affair, centred on any particular woman, helped to save him from an aggravation of his spiritual discord which might have led to tragedy. In a way Hippel might be compared with Klinger, who in maturer years also spent his life in active usefulness and rose to high office, but whose mental conflict is seen in his novels. There was however nothing of the Siegwart in Klinger, and this difference between the latter and Hippel is vital.

F. H. JACOBI

The two most important literary works of Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi are both novels. *Eduard Allwills Papiere* appeared in his brother's magazine *Iris* and in the *Teutscher Merkur*, between September 1775 and December 1776, and was published in slightly extended form in 1792 as *Eduard Allwills Briefsammlung*, Volume I, but a second volume never appeared.[1] The second novel appeared in the *Teutscher Merkur* during 1777, under the title *Freundschaft und Liebe*, in five instalments, and was also published in a slightly altered form in 1779 as *Woldemar, Eine Seltenheit aus der Naturgeschichte*, Volume I, but here again no continuation appeared. Both volumes thus remained torsos.[2]

The characters Allwill and Woldemar are in essence identical, but there is a difference in the form of the novels. In the former there are only ideal shadowy figures who write letters, in the latter these figures are

transferred into the living world, though even here there is more discussion than action.[3] Jacobi, whose early years were passed in a Pietist atmosphere, was himself subject to Weltschmerz and depicted himself in both his heroes, but he was at the same time influenced by *Werther*, with the author of which he was for some time on intimate terms, until a parody on *Woldemar*, which Goethe wrote and produced in the year 1779, led to a breach. He was a "Gefühlsphilosoph," the only philosopher of the century who shows distinct traces of Weltschmerz, (though Jung-Stilling systematised his Weltschmerz into a kind of fatalistic philosophy), and all his life he was unable to reconcile his mystic yearning with any confessional faith.

Allwill appears as more of a Stürmer und Dränger than Woldemar, and this novel was in fact written with a distinct philosophic tendency, namely to prove that feeling is more important than thinking. The key-note of the Sturm und Drang is audible, when the hero says that he was saved from spiritual confusion by his own heart, and that he would therefore continue to obey it and lend his ear to its voice. Allwill is represented as immoral

in his relations with women, and Sylli, who is herself an example of the feminine, Siegwart type of Weltschmerzler, and who is used by Jacobi as a mouthpiece for some of his own gloomy views, gives utterance to warnings of the danger which is likely to arise from intimacy with him. In the final letter, Allwill's character is minutely analysed by the "Verstandesmensch" Lucie, and a searching light thrown on its more extravagant and immoral features. It thus appears that when he was writing the latter part of his novel, Jacobi became aware of the perils of too much storm and stress, and destroyed the artistic unity of his novel by writing a polemic against the very thing he had set out to extol.[4] He seems to have realised that the same tendencies existed in his own nature and to have risen above them, just as Goethe saved himself from continuing along the path of Werther. It was however only the Sturm und Drang part of him that he thus endeavoured to repress, and which Lucie censured in Allwill. The Weltschmerz remained, as is seen in Woldemar, who is simply Allwill less Sturm und Drang, but plus a certain abstract idealism.

Allwill's attitude towards women is somewhat supercilious. He considers them incapable of real love, as he has never met one who had the elements of it. He declares that he would never seduce a woman, but he believes in the possibility of a friendly connection " so warm and intimate that it should know neither moderation nor limit," an idea of friendship which already announces Woldemar. Unlike Woldemar however, Allwill is somewhat of a Don Juan. The extreme egotism of the Weltschmerzler is of course the basis of his fickleness, which lasts until his erotic emotions become centred on a single person. Allwill confesses himself that no woman has ever inspired him with a lasting love, and so he does not get beyond the indiscriminate stage in his erotic experiences. It will be remembered that even Werther had a Lenore, to say nothing of Lenore's sister, before he met his Lotte, and that he appears to have treated her none too well.[5]

* * *

Whereas the imaginary worlds of Werther, Reiser and others, however feverishly morbid they might be, sprang from the distortion and extravagance of their emotions, and presented

them with concrete pictures which were to a greater or less extent a substitute for the reality from which they were estranged, the imagination of Woldemar gives him only abstract ideas, according to which he endeavours to fashion his life. His ideas are more real to him than actual life, and it is through the deceiving glass of these ideas that he sees the world and his own relation to it. As is hinted in the earlier title, *Freundschaft und Liebe*, the theme is the superiority of friendship to love. Woldemar and Henriette consider themselves to be friends in the most exalted sense of the word, with no erotic sympathy subsisting between them. Henriette therefore arranges a marriage between Woldemar and her friend Allwina, and takes up her abode with them, to the extreme delight of the young wife, who looks upon this friendship with the greatest favour. The story is absurd, and is in no way made more convincing by the honest belief which is entertained by both Woldemar and Henriette, that their friendship is entirely lacking in erotic attraction. They even scorn the definition of platonic love, as they are " friends, such as persons of the same sex never can be, and such as persons of

different sex perhaps never were before us." If such relations are impossible between persons of the same sex, there must be something in the difference of sex which makes them possible. As any liaison conditioned, in however small a degree, by difference of sex, must *ipso facto* contain the erotic element, therefore the latter is present unconsciously in the friendship of Woldemar and Henriette, otherwise the above remark of Woldemar is a paradox. When Henriette hears that Woldemar has laughed at the thought of marrying her, she is filled with a mixture of annoyance and grief. It seems to her quite natural that he should laugh, but she feels at the same moment " the difference—between woman and man." In other words, the difference between herself and Woldemar, which has hitherto remained in her subconsciousness, becomes visualised to her, and even if she did not realise before the sex-element in their friendship, she must realise it now. Her constant repetition from now on that she does not love Woldemar is sufficient to make one doubt it.

On the other hand, when Woldemar hears of the vow that Henriette has been forced to make to her dying father, that she will not

marry him, he becomes furious to the verge of madness. A man does not work himself into a frenzy at the breaking of a friendship. He even deludes himself that Henriette despises his sufferings, and like Tasso succumbs to the first stage of paranoia.[6] Like other Weltschmerzler he generalises from his own case, as in his letter to Allwina, where he says that he has discovered that "all friendship, all love is only delusion and folly—except for the fool." Woldemar's longing for Henriette's friendship is really a longing for someone who understands and sympathises with him. That is why his disillusionment is complete when he thinks that she has been false to him. It is only his obsession with the idea he has formed of friendship, that blinds him to the fact that the attraction Henriette exercises for him is something more than friendship. A man of Woldemar's type can only find the sympathy he craves in a woman. He is inclined to be a misogynist, and has cherished prejudices against women, believing that beyond a certain point their intellect and emotions are deceptions. In Henriette he sees his mistake. It is she who explains his old dream of friendship and realises it for him. It is the old story

of the " Verstandesmensch," and once more we see that useful person incorporated in a woman. Henriette praises the golden mean, and believes that he who is only moderately stimulated enjoys the satisfaction of his desires more than the man who is ravenous. Perhaps that is why she will not consciously allow her friendship to become anything more ardent. Woldemar calls her " die Erz-Wiedersacherinn von aller Schwärmerey ", and she and her affection are also described as being calmer and more collected than Woldemar. We have already seen her in *Allwill* under the name of Lucie.

Woldemar himself looks upon the middle way as the ideal, and seeks thereby to suppress his eroticism. " Just because my senses are extremely inflammable and I can only restrain myself with difficulty . . . . I endeavoured to control my power of imagination, and had soon got so far as to be able to be on intimate terms with the most beautiful women without losing my peace of mind in the slightest." Woldemar is really very naïf, and does not realise that the emotions are not suppressed so easily. The ideal of moderation is not in harmony with his emotional nature. His

colossal vanity is soothed in his intercourse with Henriette, but as soon as the possibility of losing her comes within his field of vision, the real nature of his friendship becomes apparent, and his egotism is inflamed. There is even a parallel to Golo in the blind selfishness with which he disregards the sufferings of the woman, to intoxicate himself with his own grief. He excuses himself from a party, alleging a headache, and Henriette sends him word that all her pleasure for the evening is spoilt. "All her pleasure for the evening spoilt," he repeats, "that may be true, and such an evening can be wearisome. Such an evening.—But I?—And a hundred evenings!—A hundred evenings and mornings!—Ten thousand.—And they were all to have been so happy.—Oh!" And later he complains that she could "weigh other things against friendship, against *my peace of mind*." It was most inconsiderate of her to destroy his peace of mind! It is but a step to Golo's complaint that Genoveva should ruin his happiness, on account of her curious whim that honour was more than life. The Weltschmerzler has great potentialities for good or evil, and a straw can send the balance down on either side.

The fact that Woldemar has developed ideas of moderation and friendship, is a factor that might have enabled him to keep an even balance both in his inward and his outward life, and does indeed do so to a certain extent. In the main, however, these ideas merely serve to provide an intellectual basis for his subjectivism, and they really stand in contrast to his passionate temperament. All the same this is an advance on Werther, whose meditation only intensified the morbidity of his emotions, and did not afford him even the slight foothold that lies within the reach of Woldemar to drag himself out of the morass of those emotions. The latter limits his circle to those who are sympathetic to him, and does not demand to be understood by everyone, as Werther did. It is therefore Werther who was the more likely to lose utter contact with his environment. The disadvantage of Woldemar's greater complexity is the introduction of a new conflict between his ideals and his own nature, with which those ideals are not in harmony. We have hitherto only seen irreconcilability of the outer world with the inner, now we observe the lack of unison between a man's ideals and his own tempera-

ment, between the head and the heart. Woldemar strives to attain his ideal but reckons without his other, truer self, and thus a new turn is given to the old Weltschmerz. His head deludes him into beliefs that the emotional part of him belies, and he even for a moment thinks it possible to cast Henriette out of his thoughts; he had existed before their friendship and found life not unendurable. Jacobi must have forgotten for the moment that he was a "Gefühlsphilosoph."

Another saving factor is the difference in his domestic circumstances as compared with those of Werther. Woldemar is not unhappily married, though he does not love his wife, whom Jacobi depicts as an impossible doll-like person. The greater the demonstrations of affection which her husband exhibits towards Henriette, the better Allwina likes it. "Every glance I gave Henriette," says Woldemar, "every tenderness I showed her, every caress I expended upon her was a kindness shown to my poor Allwina; she danced with joy." There is thus no accumulation of obstacles to make a tragic ending inevitable.

Like Jacobi himself, Woldemar has the outward ease of a man of the world, a character-

istic which is insisted on in the story, but nevertheless he at times shows the limitation of view which is to be found in the man who has had little worldly experience.

The unfavourable opinion of the novel which was formed by Goethe when it first appeared in book-form, was followed in the year 1796 by a brilliant and devastating criticism by Fr. Schlegel, who complained that what was depicted in " Woldemar " was not *Menschheit*, but *Friedrich-Heinrich-Jacobiheit*. It is strange that the features which Schlegel saw and censured in Jacobi were very largely those which he himself favoured in later years.[7]

Such elements of Schiller's character as are reflected in his early plays are also to be observed in his early poems. He himself characterised the period as that in which he took refuge in an ideal world, in order to escape from the circumstances which tortured him in this, and in the poems there is no lack of the apprehension of death and unbalanced enthusiasm for Nature, which were the symptoms of the sentimental age. His intense desire for friendship is mirrored especially in the poem "Die Freundschaft," and in the Songs to Laura he extols love as the animating impulse of the universe. It is very doubtful, however, whether there was any actual woman behind these songs; it is more than probable that they were merely inspired by his own fantasy, that he was intoxicated with the idea of love, and centred it on an imaginary object.[1] In "Das Geheimnis der Reminiszenz" and "Melancholie an Laura" especially,

the key-note is tragic, and in the latter poem, expression is given to the idea of the inexorability of fate, which was to find so deep an echo in the dramas. Into these early poems Schiller poured the bitterness and longing which his youth of repression had instilled into him. In 1784, two years after the Songs to Laura had appeared, he wrote the poems "Freigeisterei der Leidenschaft" (later called "Der Kampf") and "Resignation." These were written under the influence of his passion for Frau von Kalb, when he was fighting the mental battle of hopeless love, the absolute rights of which he defiantly asserts. It is in the early poems therefore that the seeds are to be found of such Weltschmerz as is observable in the dramas.

The heroes of Schiller's earlier dramas live in an imaginative world of their own, which is rarely reconcilable with the existing state of things. Karl Moor is his most extreme example of the megalomaniac, who believes that two men like himself could destroy the ethical structure of the whole world.[2] Fiesco and Wallenstein merely want to obtain crowns for themselves, and Don Carlos combines extravagance of language with passivity of

character, only acting under the impulse of his love for the queen.[a] They all idealise themselves in their own imagination, and are eventually brought back to earth with a jerk. Moor thinks himself the ideal robber, chosen to rectify social wrongs, but finally realises the futility of the idea, though even at the end he can still take pride in the thought that he is the " great robber." He is easily influenced by the impression of the moment, and lets himself be led by circumstances and his own emotions. Fiesco is not clear in his own mind until the last moment whether he will attempt to become the ruler of Genoa, or whether he will be content to remain its citizen, but he has an absorbing desire for admiration. Schiller's weakness for rhetoric leads him to make Fiesco even boast to Muley Hassan and to his wife, and he revels in visions which are not based on firm resolves. Even Wallenstein has not definitely made up his mind, as we see in his statement after the capture of Sesin, that he was only playing with the thought of revolt. He is practically driven to the extreme step by the capture of his confidant and the persuasions of Illo and Terzky.

The root of this surprising pliancy in men of such titanic mould, is perhaps to be found in the fatalistic philosophy in which they are all steeped. From Karl Moor's "über uns waltet ein unbeugsames Fatum" to the belief in the stars which forms the fundamental motive of *Wallenstein*, the heroes of Schiller are imbued with a profound trust in Providence. This was in fact a favourite idea of Schiller in his earlier days, and appears frequently in his letters. In *Don Carlos* it is not only the prince himself, but even Posa and Philipp who rely on Providence.[4] Hence comes what Minor calls the "genuine Schiller-characteristic of renunciation,"[5] which commences with Karl Moor and reaches its climax in Marquis Posa. Karl Moor does not remain a titan to the end, and in *Don Carlos* renunciation is given the halo of philosophy. The nearer Schiller progressed to the haven of philosophy, the more did the elegiac and pessimistic note tend to disappear. The Weltschmerz of the Songs to Laura and of *Die Räuber* gradually disappeared in proportion to the completeness with which Schiller was able to give expression to his thoughts and emotions, and to people the

world of his imagination; and just as Goethe gave final utterance to the Werther-mood in the belated *Tasso*, so did Schiller pour the remnants of his Weltschmerz into *Don Carlos* and rise refreshed.

The two most powerful influences on *Don Carlos* were Leisewitz' *Julius von Tarent* and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Carlos is a weakling, vacillating and impatient, who at the age of twenty-three mourns the lost years of his youth. Absorbed in an impossible love for his step-mother, which even to himself appears almost incestuous, he broods himself into a state which renders him incapable of taking the most common-sense precautions. As in *Julius von Tarent*, in *Werther*, *Clavigo* and *Tasso*, it is necessary to warn him to be a man.[6] Under the influence of his passion he acts in the most childish manner, and it is his total lack of self-control that brings about the whole catastrophe. Like Julius, he is torn with self-pity at the sad lot of princes, the "malheur d'être prince" which comes from Rousseau. He cannot endure the thought of being alone upon a throne, as a sympathetic soul is indispensable to his weak nature. Even King Philipp laments that he is alone. Hence

the "Verstandesmensch" Posa, who acts in the capacity of confidant to both prince and king. Just as Tasso and Antonio represent the two sides of Goethe's character, so do Carlos and Posa incorporate the two aspects of Schiller, and the significance of the greater prominence given to Posa in the latter half of the play lies in the fact that we here see Schiller casting off his Weltschmerz, which in the person of Carlos steps into the background. Schiller had carved out his philosophy of life, and in *Don Carlos* he is seen in the process of changing his mental equipment.

The strange thing is that Carlos is the greatest Weltschmerzler of all Schiller's characters, but the reason is not far to seek. The young student from the military academy had not come into contact with women, and did not understand them. In *Die Räuber* and *Fiesco* the love motive is purely secondary, and even in *Kabale und Liebe* it is only used in order to exhibit the corruption of the court. In the latter play it is Luise Millerin who suffers the inward conflict, not Ferdinand. *Don Carlos* is the first play in which Schiller was able to portray the pangs of love with any verisimilitude, and it is only when the erotic

impulse assumes definite form and combines itself with irresolution, that the complete Weltschmerzler appears.[7] The Weltschmerz is already there, but it is difficult to depict it in its entirety without bringing in the erotic motive. Moritz was the only author to do it successfully; the others needed the concreteness of a love-episode as the starting-point for the development of their characters.

Had Schiller not been educated in the monastic seclusion of the Karlsschule, it is more than probable that Karl Moor would have resembled Werther more than he does. As it is, the love-episode can be ignored in the investigation of his character, and we are shown merely a distorted idealism which has absolutely no contact with reality. His apparent titanism is the same exaggerated explosiveness that finds vent in the plays of Klinger. There is no direct development from Werther to Karl Moor. The latter is a kind of Prometheus such as Goethe was capable of depicting, but the whole difference lies between Goethe's extreme susceptibility to love, and young Schiller's inability to appreciate what passion for a woman could be. *Götz* was written before *Werther*, and *Die Räuber* was

written before *Don Carlos*. The essential characteristics of Werther were a lack of ethical will and an intense egoism, and these are seen again to an exaggerated degree, unsoftened by an absorbing love, in Karl Moor. The latter is not only in conflict with society, but also with himself. He sets out to adjust matters according to his own lights, but his very activity, which distinguishes him from Werther, is aimless and futile, and he despairs of himself. There are even reminiscences of Siegwart in the sentimental way he regards the setting sun, and like Goethe's characters, he is torn between pride and remorse, and longs for the relief of a single tear. There is the same elegiac note as in *Werther*; the face of Nature corresponds to his mood, and when it is dreary outside it is also winter in his own heart, and he toys with the thought of suicide. He conquers the temptation, as he has more self-reliance than Werther, but gives way to it at the end of the drama, when he delivers himself voluntarily to justice.

In *Kabale und Liebe* it is the heroine, and not the hero, who forms a bridge between Karl Moor and Carlos. She threatens to commit

suicide because she has to renounce her lover, though when the latter poisons her, she breaks out into laments at having to die so young. Luise is also somewhat of a "Machtweib," or super-woman, when she informs Wurm that in the event of her marrying him she will throttle him in the bridal night, but one is not persuaded that she would summon up the courage to do it. The passion for Ferdinand is represented more plastically than Schiller was able to depict the love-motive in the previous plays, but it is in her weaker moments that she appears more human.

If we were to look upon Karl Moor as a development from Werther, it would be necessary to regard Carlos as a retrogression, as he is the most Werther-like of Schiller's characters. The weaker elements especially are emphasised, such as the joy of grief,[8] the sudden changes from ecstasy to despair[9] and his dead ambition.[10] It is particularly in the first act, where Carlos pours out his soul to his friend, that he appears as such a weakling, since the author modified the character somewhat in the later scenes. The one side of Schiller's character understood the other side, and Posa reproaches Carlos with loving

nobody but himself and with taking pleasure in the thought that he is being unjustly persecuted. This selfishness and heroic pathos are characteristic also of Karl Moor and Fiesco. The robber derives a flattered pleasure from the thought of being an outcast, and both he and Carlos imagine their sorrow to be the greatest in the universe. The consequence is that they both indulge in a theatricality of imagination which betrays their kinship with the other Weltschmerzler. Fiesco stimulates his imagination with the thought of a magnificent gesture—to throw away a diadem.

Like Karl Moor and Fiesco, Carlos suffers a conflict in his own breast. He knows his passion is criminal, but cannot renounce it :

> " Thou'rt lost to me—O ! in
> This thought lies hell—and hell lies in the other,
> To have thee.—O ! I comprehend it not,
> My nerves begin to rend."

The words would not be amiss in the mouth of a Tasso. His whole power of action is paralysed by his love for the queen, and he allows his own personality to be almost completely fused in that of Posa.

A friendship such as that which exists between Carlos and Posa, had long been Schiller's ideal. He first conceived it at the military academy, where the utter lack of feminine companionship caused his natural longing for sympathy and understanding to seek satisfaction among his comrades. The same desire is expressed in his own letters during this period, and is mirrored in the letters of Julius to Raphael, in *Die Räuber*, and in *Wallenstein*, where we see the strong affection existing between an older man and a younger one. This type of friendship, which was particularly cultivated in the sentimental era, undoubtedly bordered on the homosexual, if we are to judge by the lines of *Don Carlos* which appeared in the *Thalia* version, but were suppressed in the book-edition :

"Ich stand und sah den Kuss, wornach ich geizte,
Vorbei an mir auf fremde Wangen fallen."[11]

Carlos looks up to Posa as later Max Piccolomini looks up to Wallenstein, and insists on possessing his affection. When Max loses his faith in Wallenstein, there is nothing left for him but death. Of the two passions which possess Carlos, the morbid love for his

step-mother and the equally morbid craving for the friendship of Posa, it is now the one, now the other which gains the upper hand, and it is hard to say which is the more pernicious. The cult of friendship had already found expression in Jacobi's *Woldemar*, but there it was satisfied in a more or less healthy way by the hero finding his ideal in a woman, though he himself did not recognise the existence of the erotic undercurrent. In *Don Carlos* we have the morbid love and the morbid desire for sympathy concentrated on two different persons, and the unfulfilment of the one serves to intensify the other.

The danger to his sanity is clearly expressed in Carlos' own statement that his brooding is driving him to the verge of an abyss—and the abyss is that of patricide, to be followed by marriage with his step-mother. Such a combination would have provided material for an interesting sequel with the Oedipus tragedy for its theme, for the present play presents a version of the Oedipus complex.[12]

In *Don Carlos* an evil destiny overtakes those who wish to destroy the present world-order, but nevertheless an optimistic key-note runs through the piece. In *Die Räuber* the

one point of contact between the hostile brothers, the representatives of " the hot and the cold passions," is the pessimistic conclusion at which they both arrive. Franz, who is the cold, calculating materialist, the enemy (not, as is usually the case, the friend and adviser) of the man who is guided by his emotions, expresses his philosophy in the horrible allegory of the " boggy circle of human destiny." Karl, in the Danube scene, compares life to a lottery in which there are no prizes, but later on, in the Hamlet-monologue, utters a hope for something better and a vague yearning for the world beyond. Both Franz and Karl are deeply tinged with fatalism, and it is significant that they both commit suicide, the one directly, the other indirectly.

Each of the two brothers has certain characteristics of Klinger's Guelfo, though Schiller has followed the example of Leisewitz and has taken the emotional brother for his hero, making him at the same time a man of action, which Leisewitz' Julius never was, and giving him also some of the traits of Julius' brother Guido. Both Guelfo and Karl Moor start off *fortissimo*, and there is no scope for

showing the development of their emotions, which are compelled to move in a circle. Karl Moor bears most resemblance perhaps to Maler Müller's Golo, without the latter's sensuality, though this sensuality makes all the difference in the world. Golo is a consistent character, but it is impossible to believe in the compatibility of Moor's noble nature, (on which all the commentators insist), with the massacres in which he has taken part. The most heartless criminal might have been a respectable member of society if he were given all he wanted, and a noble nature does not massacre innocent people on account of a family quarrel. Schiller had a very keen sense of the cruel, and he was inclined at times to steep his pen in mud and blood. If he had possessed the erotic instinct fully developed in his Weltschmerz days, he would probably have given us a splendid character-drawing of a sadistic megalomaniac. As it is, Karl Moor is one-sided and all out of proportion.

A pendant to Moor is the misanthrope von Hutten in the fragment *Der Menschenfeind*, which was written in 1786 but not published till 1791. The collapse of his ideals leads von Hutten to withdraw from the world,

and in his retirement he broods upon his wrongs and teaches his daughter that Nature will only be beautiful so long as she does not lift the veil that hides reality, so long as she avoids mankind and is contented with her own heart. He believes that love is only self-vanity, (which in the case of the Weltschmerzler is generally true), and makes her promise never to make a man happy. He finally decides to introduce her to society in order that she may make men unhappy who fall in love with her, a childish scheme like that of Dickens' lady in *Great Expectations*. He indulges his self-pity with sophistry, and the atmosphere of the whole fragment is resentful Weltschmerz, that of the man who has finished with the world, rather than of the youth who is just starting out. Perhaps Schiller did not complete the play because the subject had now become distasteful to him. *Don Carlos* and the historical and philosophical studies which were commencing, signified the same for him as the Italian Journey and *Torquato Tasso* did for Goethe. Weltschmerz and Sturm und Drang yielded to the objectivity of the classical period.

HEINSE

Wilhelm Heinse had two masters, Rousseau and Wieland, and the influence of both is seen in his novels, *Ardinghello*, which was completed in 1786 but not published till two years later, and *Hildegard von Hohental*, which was published in 1795. The latter novel presents for our purpose nothing which cannot be deduced from the former.

Ardinghello is a belated Stürmer und Dränger,[1] whose extravagance is modified by an intense love of art and a nostalgia for the "golden age" of Greece and Rome. "Oh Greece and Rome, how happy do you make our fantasy and how wretched our actual life." It is in antiquity that he finds the substitute for the unsatisfying age in which he lives, and where he seeks nourishment for his imagination. He is really a pagan who has been born into the eighteenth century (though the scene is set in the sixteenth), and the life-weariness which sometimes overtakes him, springs from

this anachronism. It would be going too far to stamp him altogether as a Weltschmerzler, but he cannot be ignored, as the seeds of Weltschmerz are undoubtedly there, and had he been a poor eighteenth-century poet, the natural bent of his disposition would have expressed itself. There are however two saving factors, namely, the ability to appease his imagination in the art galleries of Italy and the satisfaction of his erotic desires almost as soon as they are born. When he has to leave Rome and abandon its art treasures, the serpent Weltschmerz raises its head. "But oh, parting is real death, at which Nature shudders! . . . . Were I an artist and citizen of an ancient Republic, I might perhaps be able to wait until the serpent-stream of eternity again absorbed me into its clear depths." Similarly when he is unable to have the woman he wants, the world assumes a darker tinge, and he complains that everything in Nature is happy, except Man. Without desire there remains nothing but the grave, and a vain attempt to struggle against his passion draws from him the cry "Man is not free." The disposition to Weltschmerz could not be more clearly expressed. Ardinghello pines for end-

less worlds, and thunders at the slavery and petty tyranny of this, but he finds consolation in art and temporary divorce from the world.

The second factor is equally important, and it is in this that Ardinghello represents a distinct advance. We see here the idea of the absolute value of passion, towards which there was a tendency in Jacobi's *Allwill*, but which no one had hitherto expressed so completely as Heinse. Wieland spoke of Heinse's " priapism of the soul," but this was too unkind, and in Wieland's mouth it was a case of the pot and the kettle. Schiller's friend Körner called Ardinghello a pendant to Werther, in that the former absorbed himself in his pleasures as the latter did in his sorrows, but the antithesis is superficial. It would be more profitable to draw a parallel with Egmont, who, like Ardinghello, is inordinately sensuous and seeks distraction in pleasure, but who, on the other hand, does not degenerate into a mere sensual libertine, as Ardinghello sometimes does. The latter is able to love two women at a time, Fiordimona and Cäcilie, but he eventually bequeaths the latter to his friend, and he is even able to renounce a third from altruistic motives

There is no sentimentality whatever in this Don Juan, and for none of his numerous sweethearts does he exhibit anything more than physical passion, and yet all the time one has the impression that the potentialities of tragedy are lying latent. As a critic has put it, we are watching the drama of a "robust neurotic."[2] The Weltschmerz is there, but is for the time being blunted by the ease with which he obtains the two things he needs most—art and love.

This wealthy young libertine, who takes with both hands whatever of love and art and change of landscape the world has to offer, and yet complains that man alone is unhappy, is the forerunner of the blasé heroes of the Byron-de Musset type who were to be so prominent in the early part of the next century. He still retains however the vigour and animal health of the Sturm und Drang without the latter's ruggedness, the modification of which in Ardinghello is in itself a preparing of the way for the pallid young aristocrats of the later era. The *fatigue du nord* of which Mme. de Stael speaks, and which overcame Heinse and Moritz as well as Goethe, was nothing but Weltschmerz in one

of its aspects. The sojourn in Italy effected a revolution in the outlook of Goethe, but to Heinse it merely acted as an opiate, and *Ardinghello* is the literary fruit of his Italian journey.

Heinse's idealism does not lead to an optimistic outlook, and it is significant that he sees his social ideal in the past. The Utopia which is founded by Ardinghello on the islands of Paros and Naxos, after the murder of a relative of the Pope has compelled him to flee and become a corsair, is based on antiquity, and is a looking back, not a looking forward. Such a Utopia does not spring from a healthy optimism, and the conclusion of the book is accordingly fatalistic.

F. M. KLINGER

(Later period)

After dealing with Klinger as a writer of revolutionary dramas, it has usually been the custom of literary historians to dismiss him with a more or less terse reference to the fact that he went to Russia, abandoned the stormy theories of his youthful years, carved out a brilliant career and occupied his leisure time in writing philosophical novels which are now forgotten. A study of those novels reveals the injustice of this attitude. Klinger spent his maturity and old age in exile from the land which was never far from his thoughts, and the great yearning of his life was to retire some day to the scenes where he had spent so turbulent a youth. He was compelled to stand outside the literary movements of his time, but never lost touch with the spiritual atmosphere of Germany. It is true that his impetuosity yielded to a more philosophic calm when poverty gave place to the security of a Court post, but all his life he strove to reconcile

the two sides of his nature and to come to grips with himself. In the endeavour to attain harmony of thought and imagination, the former occupied with the melancholy experiences of actual existence, the latter fertilised by a deep-seated idealism, Klinger planned a series of works which should embrace the whole moral existence of humanity. They were to show the steady lamp of virtue as well as the will o' the wisp of illusion, the god and the beast in man, and to contain the views derived both from experience and from meditation.[1] This cycle of ten stories (of which only nine were included by Klinger in the collection) lacks the unity of a definite philosophical idea or system, owing to the sceptical point of view of the author, and the final impression is a negative one. It is unlikely that he really had the definite plan of all of them in his mind at the same time, but they cast light on the doubts by which his mind was beset, the optimism which sprang from his conviction of the innate nobility of the one half of human nature, and the pessimism which was induced by his experience of the corruption of the other half. The frequency with which he employs

dialogue, shows how he used his writings as a means of weighing the pros and cons of the problems that disturbed him.

The link between the two periods of Klinger's literary activity is to be sought for in the doctrines of the man who was by far the greatest influence in his spiritual life—Rousseau. Tendencies and thoughts of the Sturm und Drang dramas are reflected in the novels, and make it quite evident that Klinger never really bridged the abyss between the ideal and the real. The novels are all imbued with a hatred of philosophers and systems of philosophy, and Otto's remark concerning the pernicious effect of books[2] is followed in the story of Faust, the inventor of printing, by the attribution to this discovery of the universal spread of every conceivable form of corruption and crime.

The first of the series of Novels was *Fausts Leben, Taten und Höllenfahrt* which appeared in 1791, but the origin of which undoubtedly dates back to the Sturm und Drang period.[3] Like all the other Fausts, this one is a titan with clipped wings who seeks by superhuman means to tear aside the veil that hides truth from men. Again, like Goethe's Faust, though

he succeeds in casting off the trammels of the material body, he does not cast off the pleasures which the latter provides, and the first favour he obtains from the devil after the compact is an assignation with the burgomaster's wife. As in the case of Maler Müller's Faust, the main impulse which drives him to the compact with the devil is his poverty. There is an obvious resemblance between the worldly circumstances of Klinger in the middle '70's and those of his Faust, but on the whole he treats the character in a fairly objective way, and brings about the final catastrophe in accordance with the rules of dramatic necessity. Guelfo in *Die Zwillinge* was a Weltschmerzler who was unable to obtain what he wanted; Faust drinks life to the dregs, but in despair at being unable to discover any divine harmony in what he has seen and experienced, himself begs Leviathan to put an end to his existence. The contrast shows roughly the spiritual change which Klinger underwent. The inexperienced youth, ruled wholly by his emotions and with an explosive longing for the impossible, developed into the disappointed man to whom an eventful and brilliant career could not bring the happiness

which only springs from the harmony of ideals and environment. The parallel between Klinger and Faust only holds good, however, in so far as the story shows how a man with their potentialities, but without the moral fibre which Klinger himself possessed, must inevitably come to grief, and that was why, against the spirit of his time, the latter sent Faust to hell. Faust's experiences not only serve to inspire him with hatred and contempt for mankind, together with discontent at the insufficiency and limitation of his own physical and moral powers, but also induce in him a sort of cosmic Weltschmerz which causes him to feel the woes of all humanity. He breaks out on one occasion into the cry that he is overcome by the torments of the whole human race. Yet in spite of this he lacks the moral will to resist his inclinations. When it means but little or no exertion on his part, he endeavours to remedy individual acts of injustice by means which cause even more harm and misery in the long run. He interferes with the divine disposition of things, and his pigmy efforts cause more than the original evil, as is eventually pointed out to him by Leviathan. The command of Satan to the

latter is fulfilled, and Faust is driven to doubt the noble destiny of mankind. As he has no definite aim, there can be no positive result. A distinct weakness in the motivation is that Leviathan does not merely, like Mephisto in Goethe's play, appear as the tempter of Faust and the fulfiller of his desires, but has a much more positive and independent rôle. The consequent division of interest detracts from the immensity of the dramatic conflict in the soul of Faust, and tends to externalise the action.

The now familiar psychological tragedy of the desire being stronger than the power to fulfil, recurs in the two following novels *Raphael de Aquillas* and *Giafar der Barmecide.* Both men are possessed of noble instincts and a desire for the betterment of humanity, but they both brood on the inevitability of destiny, and yield resistlessly to their melancholy thoughts. Raphael's bitterness against fate is the same as that of Faust, and Giafar forgets his own power for good in his indignation at the evils of the world. He considers "Schmerz" the only emotion suitable to a man meditating on this world. It is strange that whereas Giafar exhibits the symptoms

of Weltschmerz before and during the dream, in which he sees his own potentiality for evil when he shall go out into the world, yet in the second half of the story, when his actions are real, and not part of a dream, he becomes a man of reason and the Weltschmerzler is Haroun the Caliph. The latter's state of mind reminds us of that of Maler Müller's Golo, when he orders Giafar not to consummate his marriage with the princess, in order that he may himself meet her as a virgin in the next world, and when he curses Giafar as the cause of all his misery, after he has himself caused the princess (his own sister) and her child to be murdered. Such incredible egotism borders on madness, and would be worthy of Golo reproaching Genoveva in her prison. A similar motive occurs in the dream, when Giafar, after Ahmet has spoilt his evil schemes, looks upon himself as a much-injured man. Giafar before the dream presents the completest picture of Weltschmerz to be found in all Klinger's later work. Compare the following descriptions :

> " He had long been gloomy and serious, for contemplation of the sorrows of mankind had soon impressed furrows on his

youthful brow. . . . Now he began to yield without the slightest resistance to his propensity to pursue sad thoughts and to brood over unpleasant emotions."

"Giafar now saw the world as a vast slaughter-house, dripping with blood . . ."

This sounds very much like Werther's "I see nothing but a monster, eternally devouring, eternally chewing the cud."

"He . . . sucked greedily . . . the poison which he carried with him, or which his own black resentment gave him."

"I will shun them (*i.e.* his countrymen), I will weep over their fate and mine, until darkness encloses me, and putrefaction sucks out my fibres, whose sensitiveness only tortures me."

His studies only serve to increase his doubts, to expand his imagination beyond his reasoning faculty and to lead him to complain of the limitation of human powers. Like Raphael he looks upon himself as a man apart from his fellows. The restless Mahal in the *Reisen vor der Sündflut*, discovers as a result of his travels that the root of all evil is knowledge. The

influence of Rousseau is clear. At the grave of Adam, he gives vent to his disillusionment in a pessimistic outburst, which commences with the wish that he had never been born. In *Faust der Morgenländer*, Klinger offers a solution of the conflict between the intellect and the emotions, which is the theme of so many of his novels. Abdallah, the hero, has a familiar spirit, who warns him against following any impulse which comes from the heart, and shows him the consequences which inevitably must result from any such " foolish move." Owing, however, to the veil of deception being thus torn aside from all his prospective actions, Abdallah is plunged in utter ruin and misery, and only finds final happiness in following the dictates of his own heart. The moral is that pre-knowledge of the consequences of our actions is not good for us, and only serves to paralyse our best faculties. The German Faust had obtained superhuman power, the eastern one superhuman knowledge, and both these gifts led to disaster. It is therefore only *illusion* that makes life worth living. Could any conclusion be more pessimistic ? Raphael's ethereal view of love is shattered after his first experience of its carnal

reality. He had looked upon it as an invisible, spiritual essence, and now he feels himself humiliated and akin to the animal beings around him. Again the pessimistic thought that love is base except when surrounded by the halo of illusion. It may be argued that in *Faust der Morgenländer*, Klinger intends to say that we should follow our own ideals, which come from the depths of the soul, and that this is an optimistic doctrine. If, however, reason says that the issue will inevitably be evil, the so-called optimism is conditioned by a state of mental deception and the ultimate conclusion must be pessimistic. *Giafar* hints at the moral which we see more clearly in Grillparzer's drama *Der Traum ein Leben*, of which it was the main source. Life is transitory, and man's power to fulfil is not equal to the ardent desire that urges him on, subordinated as he is to Fate.

The novel in which the exaltation of Rousseau is most evident, is also the one which bears most traces of the Weltschmerz of the '70's. In the *Geschichte eines Deutschen* there is a discussion of *Werther*, and Ferdinand, who was enthusiastic about Goethe's novel, later on falls in love with his friend's wife and

repeats the situation of Werther, except that his affection is returned. Ernst indulges in the joy of grief and nurses his "Schmerz," which he regards as a secret treasure, that would lose some of its value if he showed it to another. Ferdinand considers it as a personal injury that his friend should possess the woman whom he himself loves, and his consequent melancholy adds fuel to his passion, until he finally falls on his knees before her and clasps her in his embrace, in almost exactly the same way as Werther suddenly embraced Lotte. The erotic motive is nowhere handled with such skill, either in the dramas or the novels. Floods of tears flow as freely as with the previous generation of young lovers, and Klinger revels as he did before in long-drawn-out descriptions of spiritual torture.

The last of the novels, in point of origin, is *Der Weltmann und der Dichter*, a series of dialogues in which the real material is the life-story of the man of the world, while that of the poet takes up but little space. The two men represent the two opposite elements of Klinger's own character, the man of affairs, existing in the atmosphere of a royal Court

and the idealist, who sought refuge in his world of dreams. The conclusion is the exact opposite of that arrived at in Goethe's *Tasso*. The latter finally seeks the materialist in order to regain touch with the world from which he has become estranged. Klinger's materialist seeks the poet because the triumphs of his intellect have not sufficed to satisfy his soul. He longs for dreams, for reality has become too real; like the eastern Faust he seeks happiness in illusion. We hear little of the poet's inner life, except that he wishes to exist in an imaginary world which will protect him from "disenchantment." In order to remain a poet he must be aloof, otherwise he becomes disenchanted, and a disenchanted poet is a wretched hybrid, who belongs neither to the gods nor to men. Therefore, though in the end the poet and the statesman clasp hands after they have explained their views on life to each other, these views remain irreconcilable. Each must remain wholly what he is. The remark about the "disenchanted poet" is obviously directed at Goethe, as in a letter of March the 1st, 1798, Klinger says: "I see in everything that Goethe now writes the disenchanted

poet, and what sort of a creature that is, you shall read in the autumn."[4] He is, namely, a man who endeavours to unite in his own person the poet and the man of the world, and who employs the one to support the other. Klinger's poet possesses the " moral strength " which Tasso lacks, and which Klinger considered he himself possessed. His whole theory of the moral strength which makes the poet, and which is stressed too in some of the other novels, is also directed against Goethe.[5] The two sides of Klinger were in more jarring contrast than was the case with Goethe ; on the one hand the optimism which sprang from his ideals, on the other the resigned pessimism which issued from experience. All his life he tried to hold the balance between the two, but he never permitted himself to take the line of least resistance and fuse the statesman and the poet, as he thought Goethe had done.

In most of the heroes of the novels there is a strange mixture of restlessness and resignation ; rebellion against fate is combined with fatalism, which Klinger himself says is the source of resignation. These are not the only contradictions, and they are due to the fact that Klinger was still in doubt, was always

striving to educate himself up to a clearer philosophy of life. His most definite characteristics are scepticism and a profound sympathy with the sufferings of mankind. In *Faust der Morgenländer*, Abdallah passes through the various stages of Weltschmerz, from despondency to misanthropy. Owing, however, to the fact that he has never indulged in speculative philosophy, he is able to fight these demons. Side by side with contempt for mankind goes a boundless sympathy, resulting from extreme sensitiveness to the sorrows of others. It is in Klinger that we find the first distinct traces of that more universal, or cosmic Weltschmerz, which was to be more common in the next century. He passed from the stage of purely subjective Weltschmerz, which was concentrated solely on the ego, to the stage where he transferred the inward conflict to the external world, and the personal moment became more or less obscured (*not absorbed*) in the wider, universal aspect. A thread of bitterness runs through all the novels, and the first signs of a developing pessimism become visible. Many of the characters long in despair for death, though Klinger never reached the stage where the

consummation of life is sought in Nirvana.

As a disciple of Rousseau, Klinger was hostile to Christianity, as is seen above all in *Raphael*, in *Sahir* and in the fragment which he placed, as a suitable conclusion to the series, at the end—*Das zu frühe Erwachen des Genius der Menschheit.* He appears to have had a distinct predilection for Mohammedanism, but his scepticism lamed his enthusiasm and refused him an answer to the questions which consumed him. The Genius of Humanity, horrified at the excesses of the French Revolution, brings its complaints before the throne of the Almighty, but is met by a crushing silence. Bewildered by this awful silence, like the man who tries to pierce beyond the veil, the Genius sinks from the cloud that enwraps even the steps to the throne of the eternally Silent One, down to the gloomy earth. It is hopeless to try to see into the intentions of God, and to all his questionings Klinger never received an answer that satisfied him. His Sturm und Drang went, but the Weltschmerz remained

JEAN PAUL

Jean Paul Friedrich Richter's first literary effort was a *Werther-Siegwart* imitation, called *Abelard und Heloïse*, which he wrote in 1781. The influence of *Siegwart* is more pronounced than that of *Werther*, and the atmosphere is that of vague longing for the future world and flight from the realities of this.[1] The grinding poverty of his youth led him to try his hand at satire, but he soon closed what he called his " vinegar factory," and his most important writings fall within almost exactly the same period as the novels of Klinger, from about 1790 to 1805. If, however, the latter was the Weltschmerz-pessimist, Jean Paul was the Weltschmerz-optimist. There is sufficient of wretchedness and despair in his stories, but he rarely gets down to concrete facts ; there is no depth of bitterness and everything is vague and misty. Jean Paul was a true child of the Sturm und Drang, suffering under the same contrast between a material environment and

an inward titanism, which in his later novels he attempted to reconcile, but he differed from the earlier writers in that he was able to be an idealist and a realist at the same time. Though he never did reconcile himself to reality, yet he did not dislike it, but kept his idealism and his earthly existence, so to speak, in separate compartments. He did not fight his way through to clear ideals ; one side of him sought refuge in dreams and longings, the other side sought contentment in the humble joys of actual but restricted existence. This contrast lasted all his life and he never fused the two mental outlooks, but only alternated between them. The former is, on the whole, reflected in his novels and the latter in the idylls, though no sharp line of distinction can be drawn.

The materials with which he works are the moods of his characters, and he rarely delves far below the surface. In the later novels there is an optimistic idealism, which is too ethereal to be artistically true and which fogs the real issue. His heroes and heroines are either essentially intangible or they become so eventually, and they go through life lulled by dreams, with their eyes fixed upon some world

of shadows, which lies beyond the bounds of reason somewhere in the chaos of fantasy. They either revel in anticipated joys or are buoyed up by past ones, and in this respect Jean Paul is firmly rooted in the sentimental age. The first two novels, *Die unsichtbare Loge* (for which K. P. Moritz found him a publisher) and *Hesperus*, which took the hearts of the women by storm, exhibit little development beyond *Siegwart*, but they do contain the germs of almost all the developments which are contained in the later novels. Even Siebenkäs, the hero of the novel of that name, weeps on every occasion, and the joy of grief is relished during nights spent in the churchyard.

Gustav, the hero of the *Unsichtbare Loge*, is a pure, innocent soul, easily brought to tears, whose true home is in the next world ; he is much too ethereal for this one. The motive of *Hesperus* is slightly more tangible. Viktor is a maturer Gustav, full of youthful enthusiasms, but quite inactive. He recognises his inactivity and regrets it, but does not alter it. His imagination is stronger than his passions, and he retires within himself, to find happiness eventually in one of those women made up of

moonshine and tears, who were so popular in the sentimental era. He pities himself and indulges in theatrical fancies, as when he looks at his coat hanging up in the moonlight, and thinks of himself as a strange person to whom it belongs, who took it off so joyfully that morning and now puts it on again with such a heavy heart. Or when he pictures the way in which he shall commit suicide, with full dramatic effect. Jean Paul recognises the Weltschmerz of his hero and apostrophises him as one who prefers the poison to the balsam that shall heal his wounds, who weeps with self-pity, and when he has nothing more to love, makes grief his sweetheart.

Siebenkäs is a poet in humble circumstances, wedded to a woman who is intellectually his inferior. We have already met in Goethe the motive of the idealist who is entangled with this type of woman. The description of his gradually increasing misery is as tragic as the similar crescendo in *Anton Reiser*; and he is finally driven to play a ghastly game of mock-death and burial, so that he may leave his wife to a man with whom she may be happy, and that he, incidentally, may go and do likewise. Other Weltschmerzler, like Clavigo,

left their women when love had died, but never condoned their selfishness with the thought that it was kindness in disguise. The naïveté with which Jean Paul weaves such a motive into his story, casts light on the fantastic twist of his mind.

Jean Paul's magnum opus is *Titan*, the origins of which go back to 1793, though it was not published until 1800-3. He was therefore working at it during practically the whole period of his maturity, and it does in truth sum up all his previous literary activity and reflect the many sides of his temperament.

The two chief characters are Albano and Roquairol, in whom the author wanted to incorporate the healthy and the morbid sides of titanism, or of the " Genie." They are both full of ambitious plans, but when it comes to translating these into action, they are both wanting. Albano is the only one of the various major and minor " Genies " of the book who eventually attains the longed-for inner harmony of soul, but he does not do so by strength of ethical will. He, to put it bluntly, tramples on two women to find his ideal in a third. His chief characteristic is a Werther-like sensitiveness, and he has a mystic yearning

to *feel* the universe as Faust wanted to *know* it.[2] In spite of all the author's insistence on Albano's titanism, it is difficult to see wherein this consists. It is because of his mediocrity that he survives, when all the others come to grief. Instead of plastic form, Jean Paul indulges in lyrical ecstasy and does not develop the character of Albano as logically as he does that of Roquairol.

It is the latter who is the most interesting character in the book. Cursed with an insatiable imagination which he does not attempt to check either by reason or by will, he represents the tragedy of diseased idealism, based upon passion, which drives him to despair and suicide. In the depiction of this character Jean Paul was influenced by Jacobi's *Allwill*, as he himself admitted. Both authors wanted to write a warning against the evils arising from titanism, from which they suffered and Roquairol represents Jean Paul's most awful example. He is really hollow inside, a mere sham, and does not exist in the world of reality at all. His real world is that of his imagination, and he only has contact with reality in so far as the latter is a reflection of his fantasy. The result is that theatricality,

which we have seen as a characteristic of Werther and other Weltschmerzler, becomes with him an obsession, and this is intensified by a macabre sense of humour. He is perhaps the supreme type in German literature of the egotist who is always play-acting. His end is in keeping with his life, for he shoots himself on the stage in full view of the audience, while playing a rôle which concludes with suicide. He is totally lacking in ethical will, and there is no struggle to suppress the evils which spring from his over-heated imagination. The seduction of the blind Linda, who mistakes him for Albano, is even more shockingly immoral than Siebenkäs' mock-death and desertion of his wife. He is possessed by a dæmon, and is related in his madness to all the other Weltschmerzler whose erotic impulses were too strong for them to control. There is this difference, that he does not chose the only way out until after he has indulged his passion. The seeds of his madness are in the words he utters in the seduction scene, when he feels that Linda's embraces are not meant for him: "When then does a man know that it is just he, just this ego that is meant and loved? It is only forms that are embraced, only husks;

who presses an ego to his ego?—God perhaps." The desire for union with another ego, and the impossibility of this, which necessitates one's being thrown back upon oneself, lead to morbid introspection and consequent pathological symptoms. This thought of the loneliness of the ego occurs again in the motivation of the third titan of the novel, Leibgeber-Schoppe, whose introspection eventually leads to actual insanity. In contrast to Roquairol, he has a clear understanding of what reality is, and it is because he sees so clearly the abyss between that and the ideal that he finds life contemptible. He looks down from his lonely peak at the world for which he has only disgust and scorn. There is something similar in *Hesperus*, where Viktor speaks of himself as disgusted at the earth, for which he can find no substitute, and laughing out of sheer wretchedness at the sad comedy.

Schoppe also laughs at the sad comedy of the world, but the basis of his humour is Weltschmerz. It laughs and cries at the same time, but always finishes up by crying. The most striking example of this type of humour is the funeral oration which Viktor holds over

himself in *Hesperus*, and which again shows the awe at the mystery of the ego which so obsessed Jean Paul. This humour is at the same time a flight from reality and an attempt at reconciliation of the contrasts in his temperament, though it only covers them and does not even do that successfully. Albano, who is the only one of the titans who does not succumb, is distinguished by a complete lack of humour.

The firm hold which the Siegwart type of sentimentality had upon Jean Paul is best seen in his women characters, and it is from his attitude to women that his personality can best be understood. He was by temperament more inclined to friendship than to love, and was thus readily susceptible to the influence of Fritz Jacobi's *Allwill* and *Woldemar*. Siebenkäs yearns for an ideal woman who exists only in his imagination, whom he has often endeavoured to conjure up, but has never seen, and Walt in the novel *Flegeljahre* dreams of an ideal friend. This latter point is significant. In Jean Paul's numerous connections with women, it was generally the woman who appeared as the more loving of the two, and in at least two cases, it was she who spoke the

decisive word.[3] Jean Paul was a feminine nature, and believed more in spiritual friendships with women, as he explains in *Hesperus* in his disquisition on what he calls "Gesamt- oder Zugleichliebe," and also "Simultan-und Tuttiliebe." It is something that is too warm for friendship and too immature for love. He even acknowledges that his hero has a great deal of the woman in him. This casts a new light on such phrases as "Only a man who pines for a man-friend just as he does for a woman-friend deserves both," which stands at the beginning of the same novel, and the reference to the blind youth as "die reizende liebe Gestalt." The masculine heart that has been wounded by friendship cannot be cured by all the balsams of love, and Viktor envies the servant who carries his friend's papers for him on his way to the office. In *Flegeljahre*, Walt falls in love at first sight with the Count Klothar whom he does not get to know for a long time, and envies a man who sits next to him at table, and who could so easily caress his hand. This motive in *Flegeljahre* becomes positively repugnant, but it helps to explain why Jean Paul was unable to bring to any of the women who loved him, the absorbing love

they demanded in return. The scenes of affection between men friends, as for example the description of the parting of Leibgeber and Siebenkäs, are usually more intense than those between lovers.

This by no means excludes erotic experiences with women, but neither Jean Paul nor his characters were able to devote themselves absolutely to a woman, and perhaps the feeling of the loneliness of the ego, of the inability to get into actual touch with the ego of another person, was the important factor. It has already been pointed out that the love of the Weltschmerzler is in great part egoism, and this subordination of the object loved to the ego of the lover seems to be taken a step further, when Jean Paul lets himself be loved but refuses to love in return. He sees in women a means to an end, to intensify his own emotions and illuminate his own soul, without consideration for their feelings in the matter.[4] It is a kind of abstract sadism, where the emotions which are engendered are loved instead of the object which causes those emotions. When Liane dies, Albano consoles himself with Linda, and when she dies, he finds his ideal in Idoine. Roquairol first has

a liaison with Rabette, and then practises the basest deception in the seduction of Linda. These human sacrifices are looked upon as part of their education, and just as Lenette is deserted by Siebenkäs as being no fit wife for a poet, so Liane and Linda are only steps on the way to Albano's ideal. The culmination of the union of two beings is a submerging of the ego and temporary oblivion, and the refusal or inability to subordinate the intellect (or perhaps it would be better to say the *imagination*), to the emotions in erotic experiences, is an objective attitude to a passion which demands complete subjectivity and absorption. One of the consequences of this " artistic " attitude to love, is the theatricality which appears so often as a symptom of Weltschmerz, and which reaches its zenith in Roquairol.

When Jean Paul wanted to depict the spirit of complete and unquestioning devotion, he incorporated it in a woman. Liane is his supreme expression of the ecstatic, sentimental mood, and Linda is a titan of earthly passion, an apostle of the absolute rights of passion, of the " Freigeisterei der Leidenschaft " which is also part of the creed of Roquairol. The

essential aspect of the love-force which seeks its complement in the other sex, was foreign to his nature, and in the impossible task of expressing in concrete form the vague yearning for the infinite, he found both vent and consolation in the joy of grief and Welt-schmerz-humour.

The nostalgia which sends people back into their inner psychic world is described in *Hesperus*. There is in men a great wish, which has never been fulfilled ; it has no name, it seeks no object ; it is nothing that one can name, but it returns on summer nights when one looks towards the north or at distant mountains, when moonlight is on the earth or the sky encrusted with stars, and when one is very happy. This vast desire exalts the spirit, but is accompanied by pain. Walt in the *Flegeljahre* is overcome by this nostalgia on a Sunday, he gets " Sonntagsheimweh," while Vult, the so-called man of the world, who is supposed to be a contrast to his sentimental brother, is even more immersed in painful exaltation. " Er dankte Gott, wenn er sich nach irgend etwas unbeschreiblich sehnte, so sehr musste er sich nach Sehnen sehnen." He yearns for the sake of yearning,

since the privations and griefs of love are in themselves fulfilments and joys, and give consolation instead of needing it. In the works of Jean Paul there are numerous dream-fantasies, and they are all dreams of longing, which even in the dream generally remains unsatisfied. The complex of the dreamer tries to find an outlet in the dream, in order that in the fantastic world thus created, those desires may be satisfied which it is impossible to satisfy in the world of reality. In Jean Paul, however, the longing can never be completely fulfilled because it is an end in itself. He loves his nostalgia as he does his erotic emotions, and the object of the former is as indifferent to him as is the object of the latter.

In the *Flegeljahre*, Jean Paul makes an attempt to describe in a concrete, objective manner the two sides of his temperament by incorporating them in two twin brothers. Walt is the idealist and Vult the realist, and this juxtaposition comes to us like an echo from the '70's. The author recognises and brings forward the necessity of inner reconciliation and harmony, but is unable to give the final solution. Walt finds the complement of his own inactive nature in the driving power of Vult, who follows his brother as the

latter goes through life on his journey of self-education. The ethical aim is that Walt should step out of his dreamy inwardness into the active stream of life, and the education motive, which appears also in the other novels, comes from Rousseau. Jean Paul, however, was unable to reach the haven of ideal happiness, so he tried to find a palliative in the pleasures of domestic life, and it is to this that we owe the idylls. He is a link not so much between Sturm und Drang and Romanticism as between Klopstock-Siegwart sentimentality and Romanticism. That the *Flegeljahre* remained a fragment during the last twenty years of his life is symbolic, and so is the end of the story so far as we have it. Walt relates to Vult one of his fantastic dreams, but the latter, who has already made up his mind to leave his brother, only takes his flute and goes out into the world. Walt hears him playing in the distance, but does not know that his brother is fleeing from him. The dual personality remains dual. Jean Paul had a glimpse of the solution that Goethe found in *Wilhelm Meister*, but was unable to reach it, and his remaining works are evidence of a sinking creative power. His psychic adaptation to reality remained inadequate.

CONCLUSION

During the last thirty years of the eighteenth century, Weltschmerz appears nearly to have run the gamut of the emotions that come within its sphere, from the elegiac note on which it starts to the extremes of Promethean defiance, pessimistic philosophy and insane frenzy. It is not possible to distinguish successive phases, as many poets combine within themselves the most varied aspects of Weltschmerz, while we sometimes find a Siegwartian tearfulness at the end of the century and an extreme type in the '70's. In summarising the development, therefore, the best method of procedure is to see in what cases some new aspect is added or an old one advanced a stage further.

Throughout the period, Weltschmerz is, as a rule, purely subjective and concentrated on the ego. It is not humanity, but the individual himself, who suffers, and he regards himself as somewhat of an exception. It

is the snobbery of wretchedness of the Weltschmerz egoist. They all like to create make-believe worlds, where they seek the satisfaction that is denied them in reality. The poet's endeavour to give plastic form to ideals that are too vague to have any definite, concrete existence is generally unsuccessful. Weltschmerz in this period does not necessarily hypothecate misanthropy, pessimism or sympathy with the woes of humanity, though there are tendencies in all three directions.

Weltschmerz in its most elementary form is seen in the poets of the Göttinger Hain. In the Sturm und Drang, including Goethe, there is both sentimentality and titanism. Goethe's Faust wants satisfaction not only for the emotions but also for the intellect. Tasso brings the conflict between genius and environment, and is a Werther intensified to the point of insanity.

Lenz is Goethe's Tasso in real life. Klinger is explosive, and is too strong a character to have much sentimentality in him. Maler Müller shows in Golo the potentialities for evil in the Weltschmerzler who is in a position of supreme authority.

Anton Reiser sometimes reaches the stage

where he longs for Nirvana, and drugs himself into oblivion by reading and dreaming. He is the only Weltschmerzler who is entirely lacking in the erotic impulse. There are traces of a pessimistic philosophy, but Reiser is not objective enough for this to be permanent. His theatricality shows the extreme to which living in the imagination can lead. A momentary glimpse of cosmic Weltschmerz, when the monologues of Hamlet lead him to look upon his own misery as the common lot of humanity, is an isolated instance.

Jung-Stilling gives himself up to a blind trust in Providence, the result of a Pietistic upbringing, which Reiser tried to shake off. The consequence is that he is *consciously* inactive, whereas most of the others are consumed with a restless energy which they mistake for activity.

Hippel is a dual personality: he has the saving feature of being able to keep his dreams and his practical life separate.

Jacobi's Woldemar limits his circle to those who understand him, and does not demand to be understood by everyone as Werther did. Woldemar introduces the new conflict between his ideals and his own nature, which is in-

compatible with those ideals. He thinks he can subdue his emotions by means of the intellect, but is unsuccessful.

Schiller's Karl Moor has generally been looked upon as a development from Werther, which he certainly is not. The author's ignorance of love led him to draw an exaggerated titan whose egoism lacks the erotic outlet. He represents rather a development, in the cosmic direction, of Klinger's Guelfo. Don Carlos is nearer to Werther, and especially to Tasso, than the heroes in any of Schiller's previous plays. Schiller introduces no new aspect of Weltschmerz, but he has a stronger fatalistic strain than the others.

Heinse gives us the Weltschmerzler who keeps his Weltschmerz under, because he is able to satisfy his two keenest desires—art and love. He is a forerunner of the blasé type of Weltschmerzler of the next century.

In Klinger's novels there is a tendency to reasoned pessimism, as he now looks on the world more objectively than he did in his younger days. The recognition of the woes of humanity, combined with a boundless sympathy, makes his Weltschmerz more cosmic. The religion of the Weltschmerzler is generally

present as " longing," but Klinger is definitely sceptic.

Jean Paul, on the other hand, is inclined to be optimistic. Like Hippel, he is a dual personality. He does not dislike reality, but enjoys life in spite of its incompatibility with his ideals. His sense of isolation leads to the idea of the loneliness of the ego. He is nearly as sentimental as Siegwart, but yet portrays, in Roquairol, a blasé libertine who advocates the absolute rights of passion. Roquairol is always acting, and is the extreme example of the theatricality which is such a striking characteristic of the Weltschmerzler. His suicide on the stage in full view of the audience is the ultimate consequence of the theatricality of Werther, when the latter arranges that the pistol with which he shoots himself shall be one of Albert's, and handed over by Lotte. Jean Paul is the Weltschmerz-humourist. He is also the chief example of the Weltschmerzler whose eroticism is not founded on any woman in particular, but who loves the emotion for its own sake; the " longing " is an end in itself.

* * * * *

The Weltschmerz of the nineteenth century,

both that of Romanticism and that which was re-introduced into German literature under the influence of Byron, is a development of the Weltschmerz which was already epidemic in the eighteenth century. The Romantic movement developed naturally out of the sentimental age, the phenomenon of "longing" being common to both. Lord Byron, on the other hand, gave a new impulse to the old Weltschmerz, and the difference between *Werther* and *Childe Harold* is a difference between two worlds. They were separated by the French Revolution and all that it stood for. Professor Carré* says that neither Childe Harold nor Manfred descends from Werther, and the individualism of a Byron or a Shelley derives from more complex sources; that Goethe's novel belongs to the sentimentality of the preceding century, and its influence hardly crosses the threshold of the new era. The latter statement may be true of *Werther* itself, but after the investigation into the nature of Weltschmerz in the foregoing pages, there is no room for the slightest doubt that the dissonance between the ideal and the real, and the inability to

*Jean-Marie Carré: *Goethe en Angleterre* (Paris 1920),

adapt the ego completely to reality, is the essence of Wertherism, Weltschmerz, mal du siècle, Byronism—call it what you will. The psychic state is the same at bottom, though national and other factors help to vary the outward manifestations. A great deal depends on the extent to which the Weltschmerzler is content to live in his imagination, and not step out of it to make claims on reality which reality cannot satisfy, or is not prepared to satisfy. Carré quotes with approval an earlier French critic, who was astonished at the attempt to establish a connection between Werther and the heroes of Byron, since that which characterises the former is his impotence for action and that which characterises the latter is action pushed to its extreme limits. But surely this "action pushed to its extreme limits" is futile action, a vague restless activity which has no definite concrete aim and is therefore bound to peter out. Byron's heroes are impotent even in their activity. We have seen the same thing more especially in the heroes of Klinger's dramas and in Schiller's Karl Moor. The latter is as much a precursor of the Byronic "fallen angel" as Ardinghello is of Childe Harold.

The *ennui* and pessimistic tendency of which there were but faint strains in the eighteenth century, were the direct result of the failure of the great Revolution to create the new world which had been looked for. The realisation of universal suffering gave a broader basis to the personal feeling of wretchedness. In the England of those days there was little place for a nature like Byron's, but the traces he left on the continent were all the deeper, and there was hardly a country in Europe where his influence was not felt. He re-introduced Weltschmerz into Germany under the name of Byronism, which contained the significant new element of self-mockery. His influence is most noticeable in the writings of Heine.

It has been said that Byron is the key to Schopenhauer. Pessimism may be the logical consequence of Weltschmerz, but one does not become a pessimist until one recognises the objective sorrow of the world and not merely the subjective. The Weltschmerzler looks upon himself either as an exception or as one of a select few. His suffering is a privilege, but the pessimist looks upon it as a world law, and that alone can be a philosophy. Nietzsche has taken the matter a step further, and has

shown the latent power that lies in the joy of grief. He uses the very sufferings of the world to assert the triumph of life, and there is thus an unbroken, psychological progression and development from the age of sentimentality to the age of the superman.

NOTES

GOETHE

[1] Goethes *Gespräche*. Gesamtausgabe, hrsg. von Frhr. v. Biedermann. (Leipzig. 1910). Vol. III. p 59.

[2] Friedrich Hebbel says: "Werther erschiesst sich nicht, weil er Lotten, sondern weil er sich selbst verloren hat." (Tagebücher, hrsg. F. Bamberg. Berlin, 1885. I. 132).

[3] Babbit: *Rousseau and Romanticism*. (Boston & New York, 1919). p. 318.

[4] F. Gundolf: *Goethe*. (Berlin, 1918). Chapter on "Werther."

[5] *Ibid*, p. 169.

[6] A. Schoell: *Briefe und Aufsätze von Goethe aus den Jahren* 1766-1786. (2. Ausgabe. Weimar, 1857). pp. 143-5.

[7] Cf. H. Loiseau: *L'Evolution morale de Goethe*. (Paris, 1911). p. 282.

[8] October 12th, 1772: "Ossian hat in meinem Herzen den Homer verdrängt". Oswald Spengler (*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*. München, 1920. Vol. I., p. 159), calls Werther "das Bild einer Epoche, die jeder faustische, aber kein antiker Mensch kennt."

[9] Bielschowsky: *Goethe*. (Munich, 1920). Vol. I., p. 247.

[10] Cf. Loiseau. *Op. cit.* pp. 253-4.

[11] Cf. Iwan Bloch: *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit*. (Berlin, 1919). Chapter viii.

[12] *Urfaust*, ll, 33-44. (E. Schmidt: *Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt*. Weimar, 1901, p. 2).

[13] *Urfaust*, l, 23.

[14] Cf. Calvin Thomas: *Goethes Faust.* Vol. I. (London) p. 266. "While the text as we have it is certainly the work of 1797-1801, yet it contains certain peculiar thoughts and expressions which can be parallelled very closely from Goethe's pre-Weimar writings. These may be only the result of a conscious attempt on the poet's part to return to the mental associations of his youth, or he may have elaborated the scene from an early 'concept.'"

[15] ll, 102-6.

[16] J. Collin: *Goethes Faust in seiner ältesten Gestalt.* (Frankfurt a. M., 1896). p. 44.

[17] Calvin Thomas: *Faust,* Intro. p. xliii.

[18] O. Plümacher: *Der Pessimismus in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart.* (Heidelberg, 1884). Chapter iv.

[19] A. Baumgartner: *Goethe.* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1911), p. 535.

[20] Bielschowsky: *Goethe.* (Munich, 1920). Vol. I. p. 436.

[21] *Op. cit.,* p. 486

[22] Loiseau: *op. cit.,* p. 744-5

[23] Cf. also Loiseau: *op. cit.,* p. 749.

[24] Cf. ll, 930-2. Act II: Sc. 1. "Der Mensch ist nicht geboren, frei zu sein u.s.w.", and ll, 2720-1. Act IV. Sc. 4. Also l, 2443. Act IV. Sc. 2; in the midst of his enquiries of Leonore concerning the princess's feelings towards him, he cannot help giving expression to his fear of losing his patron's favour.

[25] ll, 2989 ff. Act V. Sc. 2., and ll, 3099-3100. Act V. Sc. 3.

STURM UND DRANG

[1] M. N. Rosanow: *J. M. R. Lenz, sein Leben und seine Werke.* (Translated from the Russian. Leipzig, 1909). p. 58.

[2] M. Rieger: *Klinger in der Sturm und Drang-Periode.* (Darmstadt, 1880). p. 222.

[3] Written in 1775. First published in *Goethe-Jahrbuch,* Vol. X., 1889 p. 54 ff. Reprinted in Lenz: *Gesammelte Schriften.* hrsg. von F. Blei. Vol. V.

[4] Quoted by Lenz: *Gesammelte Schriften.* Vol. V. Notes p. 389. The whole letter printed in E. Dorer-Egloff: *Lenz und seine Schriften*, p. 182.

[5] In a letter to Boie dated 11th March, 1776, Lenz speaks of "ein kleiner Roman in Briefen von mehreren Personen, der einen wunderbaren Pendant zum Werther geben dürfte." (Freye und Stammler: *Briefe von und an J. M. R. Lenz.* Leipzig, 1918.) Vol. I., p. 127.

Cf. also M. Sommerfeld: *J. M. R. Lenz und Goethes Werther.* (*Euphorion.* 1922. Bd. XXIV. Heft i, p. 72 footnote.)

[6] Cf. Sauer: *Stürmer und Dränger.* Vol. II., p. 185. Honesta's letter: "Ich aber behaupte, dass der Grund davon in seinem Herzen liegt, und dass er auch ohne Werther und Iris das geworden wäre, was er ist." Here Lenz himself appears to deny that his work is a mere imitation.

[7] Erich Schmidt: *Lenz und Klinger.* (Berlin, 1878).

[8] Sauer: *op. cit.*, p. 209. Plettenberg speaks of Herz's "Gemütskrankheit" and p. 206: Rothe writes to Plettenberg "Haben Sie also die Gütigkeit, ihn so zu empfangen, wie ein weiser Arzt einen höchst gefährlichen Kranken empfangen würde."

P. 197. *Honesta.* "Diese Geschichte ist *so wie das ganze Leben Herzens ein solch unerträgliches Gemisch von Helldunkel*, dass ich sie Ihnen ohne innige Aergernis nicht schreiben kann. Kein Zustand der Seele ist mir fataler, als wenn ich lachen und weinen zugleich muss, Sie wissen, ich will alles ganz haben, entweder erhabene Melancholei oder ausgelassene Lustigkeit."

In the same letter she refers to "der delikate, der fein organisierte Herz." In a later letter (p. 202) she calls him "einen gespannten Menschen." P. 203, she refers to him as "dessen ganzes Glück in Träumen besteht und der das, was man solid nennt, mit Füssen tritt."

[9] Max von Waldberg: *Der Waldbruder.* (Berlin, 1882.) Introduction.

[10] *Lenz und Klinger*, p. 48.

[11] Cf. "*Briefe über die Moralität des jungen Werthers*', von Lenz. *Eine verloren geglaubte Schrift der Sturm-*

und Drangperiode aufgefunden und herausgegben von L. Schmitz-Kallenberg. (Münster i.W., 1918.)

[12] P. 206. Rothe describes to Plettenberg the shattering of Herz's illusions about the three women he fell in love with in his youth; "Das Leben ward ihm zur Last, er zog in der Welt herum von einem Ort zum andern nimmer ruhig, und hätte seine Existenz gar zu gern mit eigner Hand verkürzt, *wenn er nicht den Selbstmord, ohne dringende Not, nach seinem Glaubenssystem für Sünde gehalten hätte.*"

In the *Moralische Bekehrung eines Poeten* (p. 58), however, we do meet thoughts of suicide on account of love for another man's wife. Robert in *Die Engländer* puts an end to his life, but when this play was written, signs of the insanity that clouded Lenz's later years were already visible.

[13] In Lenz's play, Don Prado is married to Seraphine, but agrees only to lend his name. The *de facto* husband is Strephon. This is not a *marriage à trois* as in the earlier version of *Stella*, but a glorification of cicisbeism, and Strephon is another unbalanced nature, of exaggerated egotism, but aimless and inert in practical life.

[14] *Der Waldbruder*. P. 179. Cf. also p. 206: Rothe writes that Herz sees all men and all actions in an ideal light, and that with all his misfortunes, the ideas of his youth have never left him.

[15] Cf. Act III. Sc. 1. *Grimaldi*. Guelfo, ein herrlicher Gedanke durchzittert mich—nicht zu seyn!

Guelfo. Schwärme Du immer, Grimaldi! Mich deucht, man müsse sich rächen und dann sterben.

In Act II. Sc. 2., the old Guelfo laments his son's attachment to Grimaldi, who saddens him with his melancholy, who apostrophises the stars and whose favourite spot is the churchyard, where he lies at night and weeps.

[16] Cf. Act II. Sc. 3. *Das leidende Weib*, with its reference to Werther: *Franz*. Unglücklicher, ich hab dir immer nachgeweint, als wärst du mein Bruder.

Läufer. Du scheinst's zu verteidigen.

Franz. Nimmer. Lass mir meine Kraft.

[17] *Die Räuber*, Act I, Sc. 2. *Otto*, Act II, Sc. 7.

[18] Act II. Sc. 2. Cf. also Act IV. Sc. 5, where the Duke asks the madman whether his state is due to unnatural children. He thinks the only possible cause for despair must be the same as in his own case.

[19] Act I. Sc. 1. *Julius.* Ich rief: "Julius, Julius, sei ein Mann!" . . . aber das "Sei ein Mann!" zerschmolz wieder in einen Seufzer der Liebe.

Cf. the poem in *Werther*: "Sei ein Mann, und folge mir nicht nach" and *Clavigo* Act IV.: *Carlos.* Ermanne dich!

[20] Act II. Sc. 5. "Nach Freiheit schnappen."

[21] Act IV. Sc. 2, on returning from a ride, to take a final look at the familiar countryside: "Ich habe mir das Bild aller dieser Gegenden tief eingeprägt; es ist so angenehm, in einer weiten Entfernung die väterlichen Fluren in Gedanken zu durchirren;—*das soll mir Stoff für meine zukünftigen schwärmerischen Abende sein.*" Only a genuine Weltschmerzler could have penned these lines with such naïf effect.

[22] G. Kutschera von Aichbergen: *J. A. Leisewitz.* (Wien, 1876). p. 90. Note 1.

[23] E. g. Act III. His sense of self-humiliation, and of the respect with which Eva inspired him even "in *dem* Augenblick, dem kritischen Augenblick, der unmittelbar auf den Genuss folgt, in dem uns die grösste Schönheit anekelt."

[24] Act IV. Sc. 6. "Mocht' ich doch gleich hier versinken in Schmerz zu deinen Füssen! Du könntest dann deinen stolzen Triumph enden, könntest über mir stehen, über der Leiche, und frohlocken, dass du mich erlegst." Here once more is the theatricality of Werther, that we have rather missed in the other characters.

[25] *Ibid.* "Genoveva, wenn das Tugend ist, so weine der Himmel, dass es Tugend gibt, die den Unglücklichen verstösst." Act. IV. Sc. 7. "Was hatte sie es gekostet, mich vom Tode zu erlösen? Nichts! Nur niederträcht' ger Stolz, nur Labung an meiner Qual, nur Freude, mich elend zu sehen! *Um einer Grille eines Menschen Leben zerstört.*"

Because she will not yield to him, he is willing to agree

to the execution of Genoveva and her child, justifying it on the ground of her "hard-heartedness and cruelty," and later (Act IV. Sc. 10), he blames her for his crimes: "Sie ist mein Unstern, der mich von einem Jammer zum andern treibt." In the idea that Genoveva is intentionally making him unhappy, there is the beginning of paranoia, which however in Golo does not become universal.

[26] B. Seuffert: *Maler Müller.* (Berlin 1877). p. 143 ff. Hettner: *Literaturgeschichte des 18ten Jahrhunderts.* 3. Teil. III. Buch. (Braunschweig 1894). p. 245.

GÖTTINGER DICHTERBUND

[1] Cf. *Siegwart, Eine Klostergeschichte.* (3 Teile. Carlsruhe, 1777). p. 4: "Noch lieber hörte er die Nachtigall des Abends, wenn die Blumen und die Apfelblüten süsser dufteten, und alles still war, und der Mond herabsah. Da hatte er Gefühle, die beym Jüngling, der ihm gleich ist, zu Liedern werden. Da dachte er oft an seinen Bruder, der . . . gestorben war, und machte einst ein Lied auf ihn; da vergass er oft sich und die ganze Welt. . . Nach dem Abendessen lag er wieder unter seinem Kammerfenster . . . und träumte sich im Schlaf in paradiesische Gegenden zu seinem Bruder."

P. 8. "Seine Seele war jetzt weich wie Wachs; unwillkürliche Thränen, die das Mittel zwischen Wehmut und Freude hielten, glänzten ihm im Auge."

P. 418. "Die Einsamkeit ist des Menschen beste Freundin."

P. 834. After Siegwart has been separated from Marianne, he says to his friend Kronhelm (whose wife has just recovered from childbirth): "Ihr glaubt jetzt im Himmel zu sein. Möchte dieser Himmel ewig währen, wie der, dem sich meine ganze Seele zusehnt! *Lasst nur mir meinen Jammer*! Lasst mich eilen, und mich ihn in meiner Einsamkeit ausweinen, wo ich kein lebendiges und glückliches Geschöpf störe. Ich sehe, diese Welt ist nicht für mich: oder ich bin nicht für sie. Ich kann nicht glücklich werden; aber ich will auch keinen

unglücklich machen ! . . . Ach, ich kann, ich kann nicht glücklich werden ! Lasst mich in mein Kloster, dass ich meine Lebenszeit verweine."

[2] After meeting Marianne, he changes his mind with regard to entering a cloister, but after he has received false news of her death, he returns to his monastic idea. On another occasion he meets with a hermit and decides to go and live with him, but when Kronhelm comes to take him away he goes willingly.

[3] *Anton Reiser.* (Leipzig. Insel Verlag). p. 339.

[4] *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (Leipzig). Vol. I., p. 396.

[5] Hölty's collected poems were first published by Stolberg and Voss in 1783.

[6] The obituary published in Kürschner's D.N.L. *Der Göttinger Dichterbund.* 2. Teil. Intro., p. xv.

[7] Schiller: *Ueber Matthissons Gedichte.*

K. P. MORITZ

[1] Cf. H. Eybisch: *Anton Reiser.* (*Probefahrten* Vol. 14, Leipzig, 1909)., p. 159f. *Anton Reiser* had a decided effect on Goethe, who attests to its influence on *Wilhelm Meister.*

[2] *Anton Reiser.* (Leipzig. Insel Verlag). p. 108. Cf. also p. 209: " Das war wieder the joy of grief, die Wonne der Tränen, die ihm von Kindheit auf im vollen Masse zuteil ward, wenn er auch alle übrigen Freuden des Lebens entbehren musste."

[3] *Beiträge zur Philosophie des Lebens.* (2. verbesserte Auflage. Berlin, 1781). p. 72.

[4] Cf. F. Blei: *Fünf Silhouetten in einem Rahmen* (*Die Literatur* hrsg. G. Brandes. Vol. XIII. Berlin). p. 57.

[5] Cf. F. Blei: op. cit., p. 62f.

JUNG-STILLING

[1] They were followed by *Heinrich Stillings häusliches Leben* in 1789, the *Lehrjahre* in 1804 and, after Jung-Stilling's death, the fragment *Heinrich Stillings Alter* in 1817 by his grandson.

[2] Cf. G. Stecher: *Jung-Stilling als Schriftsteller.* (*Palaestra*, CXX. Berlin, 1913), p. 114ff.

HIPPEL

[1] Cf. J. Czerny: *Sterne, Hippel und Jean Paul.* (*Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte.* No. XXVII. Berlin, 1904).

F. H. JACOBI

[1] Cf. the *Nachschrift im Jänner* 1812 by Jacobi in the *Ausgabe letzter Hand*, 1826.

[2] Frida David in her *F. H. Jacobis "Woldemar" in seinen verschiedenen Fassungen* (*Probefahrten.* Vol. XXIII. Leipzig, 1913), gives an exhaustive account of the different editions of *Woldemar* and the details in which they differ.

[3] Cf. E. Zirngiebl: *F. H. Jacobis Leben, Dichten und Denken.* (Wien., 1867), p. 19ff.

[4] E. Zirngiebl, *op. cit.*, quotes a letter from Jacobi to G. Forster, in which he says "Ich weiss nicht, was Kräftigeres gegen die sogenannte Geniesucht geschehen konnte."

[5] Cf. the first letter of *Werther.*

[6] In the dedication to the edition of 1794, Jacobi says that a copy of *Tasso* which Goethe had sent to him in 1790, had reminded him again of *Woldemar* and had given him the impulse to recast it for a new edition. He was not however unstinting in his praise of *Tasso*; he was pleased with the style, but did not like the characters.

[7] Cf. R. Haym: *Die romantische Schule.* (Berlin 1920), pp. 260-5.

SCHILLER

[1] Cf. Kuno Fischer: *Schiller-Schriften. Erste Reihe.* (Heidelberg, 1891), p. 49ff.

[2] *Die Räuber*, Act V. Sc. 2.

[3] Cf. the utterance of Don Carlos with the above remark

of Karl Moor. *Schillers Sämtliche Schriften.* Historisch-kritische Ausgabe von K. Goedeke. 5. Teil, II. Bd., hrsg. von H. Sauppe. (Stuttgart, 1869). l. 1013f.

" Arm in Arm mit dir,
So fordr' ich mein Jahrhundert in die Schranken."

[4] Cf. l., 2089f. *Philipp.* Jetzt gieb mir einen Menschen, gute Vorsicht—
Du hast mir viel gegeben.

l. 2965. *Posa.* Den Zufall giebt die Vorsehung.

l. 683. In the oldest versions Carlos addresses Providence, " Hör' es, grosse Vorsehung ! " and when he says l.685, " Du nahmst mir meinen Himmel nur, um ihn In König Philipps Armen zu vertilgen," it is Providence he is addressing and not the Queen.

[5] J. Minor : *Schiller. Sein Leben und seine Werke.* (2 Vols, Berlin, 1890). Vol. II., p. 152.

[6] l.765 ff. *Carlos.* Zu spät ! O Gott, es ist zu spät !
Königin. Ein Mann zu seyn ?

[7] In 1784 Schiller met Charlotte von Kalb, who was married to a man she did not love, and fell in love with her. *Don Carlos* was the first play to be published subsequently.

[8] In the first book-edition of 1787 there occurred the following lines, which were suppressed by Schiller in the 1801 edition (Cf. Goedeke : *Sämtliche Schriften.* Vol. V. Pt. 2, Footnote to line 1081) :

" Was Wollust aus der Marter presst, was selbst
den Kummer neidenswürdig macht, den Menschen
noch einmal an den Himmel knüpft, und Engel
zur Sterblichkeit herunterlocken könnte,
des Weinens süsse Freuden kennt er nicht."

[9] Likewise suppressed in the 1801 edition were the lines (1290 ff) he uttered when he received the love-letter he thought was from the queen, after he had previously been in the depths of despair :

" Ich bin
der Glücklichste der Glücklichen, so weit
das Unermessliche von Bürgern wimmelt.
Ich bin geliebt ! Allmächtiger ! warum
warum bin ich nicht Herr von deiner Welt,
um sie in meiner Freude zu verschenken ! "

[10] Cf. Act I. Sc. 2. First dialogue with Posa.
[11] These two lines followed l.217 in the *Thalia* version.
[12] Cf. l.348ff., and l.744.

HEINSE

[1] Cf. his Klinger-like outburst, *Ardinghello.* p. 319. End of the March letter. *Wm. Heinses Sämmtliche Schriften.* (Leipzig, 1857). I.Bd.
[2] Walter Brecht: *Heinse und der ästhetische Immoralismus.* (Berlin, 1911). Intro., p. x.
Brecht's remark refers to Heinse himself, but is equally applicable to Ardinghello.

KLINGER (later period)

[1] Foreword to *Fausts Leben.*
[2] Supra, p. 41.
[3] Cf. G. J. Pfeiffer and B. Seuffert: *Klingers Faust.* (Würzburg, 1890).
[4] M. Rieger: *Briefbuch zu Fr. Max. Klinger.* (Darmstadt, 1896), p. 39. Postscript to letter to Nicolovius.
[5] Cf. M. Rieger: *Klinger in seiner Reife.* (Darmstadt, 1896)., p. 402 ff.

JEAN PAUL

[1] Printed (in abbreviated form) by Paul Nerrlich in *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte.* (Leipzig, 1881). Vol. X., p 496-520.
[2] Cf. R. Rohde: *Jean Pauls Titan.* (*Paluestra.* No. CV. Berlin, 1920), p. 52.
[3] Cf. P. Kluckhohn: *Die Auffassung der Liebe in der Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts, etc.* (Halle., 1922) p. 247.
[4] Cf. F. Poppenberg: *Bibelots.* (Leipzig, 1904) p. 208-224 and Iwan Bloch: *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit.* (Berlin, 1919), p. 177.

CHRONOLOGY

Dates of publication except where otherwise stated

1773.	Götz von Berlichingen.	Goethe.
1774.	Werther.	,,
	Clavigo.	,,
	Der Hofmeister.	Lenz.
1775.	Moralische Bekehrung eines Poeten. (Written. Not pubd. till 1889).	,,
	Briefe über die Moralität des jungen Werthers. (Written. The MS. not pubd. till 1918).	,,
	Otto.	Klinger.
	Das leidende Weib.	,,
1775-6.	Edward Allwill. (Printed as "E. Allwills Papiere" in the magazines "Iris" and the "Teutscher Merkur.")	Jacobi.
1776.	Stella.	Goethe.
	Der Waldbruder. (Written. Not pubd. till 1797).	Lenz.
	Die Soldaten.	,,
	Die Freunde machen den Philosophen.	,,
	Die Zwillinge.	Klinger.
	Sturm und Drang.	,,
	Julius von Tarent.	Leisewitz.
	Die Kindesmörderin.	Wagner.
	Situation aus Fausts Leben.	Maler Müller.
	Siegwart.	J. M. Miller.
1777.	Der Engländer.	Lenz.
	Der verbannte Göttersohn.	Klinger.
	Woldemar. (Printed as "Freundschaft und Liebe" in the "Teutscher Merkur.")	Jacobi.
	Heinrich Stillings Jugend.	Jung-Stilling.
1778.	Fausts Leben.	Maler Müller.
	Heinrich Stillings Jünglingsjahre.	Jung-Stilling
	,, ,, Wanderschaft.	,,

1778-81.	Lebensläufe nach aufsteigender Linie.	Hippel.
1779.	Woldemar. (In book-form, slightly altered).	Jacobi.
1780.	Beiträge zur Philosophie des Lebens.	Moritz.
1781.	Golo und Genoveva. (Completed. Not pubd. till 1811).	Maler Müller.
	Matthisson's Poems. (Earliest poems written between 1777 and 1778. Attained popularity with 2nd Ed., 1783)	Matthisson.
	Die Räuber.	Schiller.
1782-5.	Schiller's early Poems.	,,
1783.	Hölty's Poems. (Collected poems first pubd.).	Hölty.
	Fiesco.	Schiller.
1783-90.	Anton Reiser.	Moritz.
1784.	Kabale und Liebe.	Schiller.
1787.	Don Carlos.	,,
1788.	Ardinghello. (Completed in 1786).	Heinse.
1790.	Faust. Ein Fragment. (*Urfaust* not pubd. till 1887).	Goethe.
	Torquato Tasso.	,,
1791.	Der Menschenfeind. (Written in 1786).	Schiller.
	Fausts Leben, Taten und Höllenfahrt.	Klinger
1792.	Eduard Allwills Briefsammlung. (In book-form, slightly altered).	Jacobi.
1792-4.	Giafar der Barmecide.	Klinger.
1793.	Raphael de Aquillas.	,,
	Die unsichtbare Loge.	Jean Paul.
1795.	Reisen vor der Sündflut.	Klinger.
	Hesperus.	Jean Paul.
1796-7.	Siebenkäs.	,,
1797.	Faust der Morgenländer.	Klinger.
1798.	Geschichte eines Deutschen der neuesten Zeit.	,,
	Der Weltmann und der Dichter.	,,
1800.	Wallenstein.	Schiller.
1800-3.	Titan. (Origins go back to 1793).	Jean Paul.
1803.	Das zu frühe Erwachen des Genius der Menschheit.	Klinger.
1804-5.	Flegeljahre.	Jean Paul.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

N.B.—The general bibliography includes all essential works which deal with Weltschmerz in its general aspects. Otherwise, only those books are mentioned which are referred to in the text, or which have been of particular use.

GENERAL

H. Hettner: *Literaturgeschichte des 18ten Jahrhunderts.* 5th Edition (Braunschweig, 1909).

O. Plümacher: *Der Pessimismus in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart.* (Heidelberg, 1884).

H. Kraeger: *Der byronische Heldentypus.* (*Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte.* Vol. VI., Munich, 1898).

E. Schmidt: *Richardson, Rousseau und Goethe.* (Jena, 1875).

G. Brandes: *Main Currents in 19th Century Literature.* (London, 1901. Vols. I & II.)

H. Breitinger: *Studien und Wandertage.* (Chap. X. *Neues über den alten Weltschmerz.* Frauenfeld. 1890).

J. H. Witte: *Der Weltschmerz in der Dichtung und die Weltschmerzdichtung.* (*Sinnen und Denken.* Halle-Saale, 1889).

A. Bienengräber: *Schmerz und Weltschmerz.* (*Sammlung von Vorträgen für das deutsche Volk.* hrsg. Frommel und Pfaff. Vol. III. No. 7. Heidelberg, 1880).

W. A. Braun: *Types of Weltschmerz in German poetry—Hölderlin, Lenau and Heine.* (*Columbia University Germanic Studies.* Vol. II. No. 2, 1905).

J. B. Meyer: *Weltelend und Weltschmerz.* (Bonn, 1872).

C. Lombroso: *The Man of Genius.* (*Contemporary Science Series,* London, 1891).

K. Hillebrand: *Die Wertherkrankheit in Europa* (*Zeiten, Völker und Menschen.* Vol. VII., pp. 102-142. Strassburg, 1885).
F. H. OttoWeddigen: *Lord Byrons Einfluss auf die europäischen Litteraturen der Neuzeit* (Hannover, 1884).
E. K. Chambers: *Poetry and Pessimism.* (*Westminster Review.* Vol. CXXXVIII. October, 1892).
Anon: *Der Weltschmerz in der Poesie.* (*Europa,* 1869. No. 16, Leipzig).
E. Caro: *La Maladie du Pessimisme au xix^e Siècle.* (*Revue des deux Mondes.* Vol. XXIV. November and December, 1877).
Irving Babbit: *Rousseau and Romanticism.* (Boston and New York, 1919).
J. Rehmke: *Die Philosophie des Weltschmerzes.* (St. Gallen, 1876).
Salinger: *Der Weltschmerz in der Poesie.* (*Sonntagsbeilage zur Vossischen Zeitung,* 1903. Nos. 39 and 40).
Ernst Gnad: *Literarische Essays.* (*Der Weltschmerz in der Poesie.* 2. Aufl., 1891, p. 247ff.).
P. Kluckhohn: *Die Auffassung der Liebe in der Literatur des 18ten Jahrhunderts und in der deutschen Romantik.* (Halle a. S., 1922).
A. Mordell: *The Erotic Motive in Literature.* (London, 1919).
Iwan Bloch: *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit.* (Berlin, 1919).

* * * *

M. Lauterbach: *Das Verhältnis der 2. zur 1. Ausgabe von Werthers Leiden.* (*Quellen und Forschungen.* Vol. CX., Strassburg, 1910).
J. W. Appell: *Werther und seine Zeit.* (4. Aufl. Oldenburg, 1896).
Frhr. von Biedermann: *Goethes Gespräche.* Gesamtausgabe. ((Leipzig, 1910).
F. Gundolf: *Goethe.* (Berlin, 1918).
A. Bielschowsky: *Goethe.* (Munich, 1920).
A. Baumgartner: *Goethe.* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1911).
A. Schoell: *Briefe und Aufsätze von Goethe aus den Jahren* 1766-86. (2. Ausg. Weimar, 1857).
Jean-Marie Carré: *Goethe en Angleterre.* (Paris, 1920).

H. Loiseau : *L'Evolution morale de Goethe.* (Paris, 1911).
O. Spengler : *Der Untergang des Abendlandes.* (Vol. I., Munich, 1920).
E. Schmidt : *Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt.* 7th Impression. (Weimar, 1909).
J. Collin : *Goethes Faust in seiner ältesten Gestalt.* (Frankfurt a. M., 1896).
Calvin Thomas : *Goethes Faust.* (Heath ; London).
F. Sauer : *Stürmer und Dränger.* (*Kürschners D.N.L.*).
M. N. Rosanow : *J. M. R. Lenz, sein Leben und seine Werke.* (Translated from the Russian. Leipzig, 1909).
M. Rieger : *Klinger in der Sturm und Drang Periode.* (Darmstadt, 1880).
M. Rieger : *Klinger in seiner Reife.* (Darmstadt, 1896).
M. Rieger : *Briefbuch zu Fr. Max. Klinger.* (Darmstadt 1896).
G. J. Pfeiffer and B. Seuffert : *Klingers Faust.* (Würzburg, 1890).
E. Schmidt : *Lenz und Klinger.* (Berlin, 1878).
Freye and Stammler : *Briefe von und an J. M. R. Lenz.* (Leipzig, 1918).
M. Sommerfeld : *J. M. R. Lenz und Goethes Werther.* (*Euphorion* 1922 ; Bd. XXIV. Heft. 1).
M. von Waldberg : *Der Waldbruder.* (Berlin, 1882).
L. Schmitz-Kallenberg : *" Briefe über die Moralität der Leiden des jungen Werthers" von Lenz. Eine verloren geglaubte Schrift der Sturm-und Drangperiode* (Münster i.W. 1918).
G. Kutschera von Aichbergen *J. A. Leisewitz.* (Vienna, 1876).
B. Seuffert : *Maler Müller.* (Berlin, 1877).
W. Krebs : *Fr. von Matthisson.* (Berlin, 1912).
H. Eybisch : *Anton Reiser.* (*Probefahrten.* Vol. XIV., Leipzig, 1909).
F. Blei : *Fünf Silhouetten in einem Rahmen.* (*Die Literatur,* hrsg. G. Brandes. Vol. XIII. Berlin).
G. Stecher : *Jung-Stilling als Schriftsteller.* (*Palaestra,* Vol. CXX., Berlin, 1913).
J. Czerny : *Sterne, Hippel und Jean Paul.* (*Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte.* Vol. XXVII., Berlin, 1904).

F. J. Schneider: *Th. G. von Hippel in den Jahren* 1741 *bis* 1782. (Prague, 1911).
Frida David: *F. H. Jacobis Woldemar in seinen verschiedenen Fassungen.* (*Probefahrten.* Vol. XXIII. Leipzig, 1913).
E. Zirngiebl: *F. H. Jacobis Leben, Dichten und Denken.* (Vienna, 1867).
A. Holtzmann: *Uber Eduard Allwills Briefsammlung.* (Jena, 1878).
F. Brüggemann: *Die Ironie als entwicklungsgeschichtliches Moment.* (Jena, 1909).
R. Haym: *Die Romantische Schule.* (Berlin, 1920).
Kuno Fischer: *Schiller-Schriften. Erste Reihe.* (Heidelberg, 1891).
J. Minor: *Schiller. Sein Leben und seine Werke.* (Berlin, 1890).
W. Brecht: *Heinse und der ästhetische Immoralismus.* (Berlin, 1911).
F. Poppenberg: *Bibelots.* (Leipzig, 1904).
J. Volkelt: *Die Kunst des Individualisierens in den Dichtungen Jean Pauls.* (Munich, 1902).
P. Nerrlich: *Jean Paul. Sein Leben und seine Werke* (Berlin, 1889).
P. Nerrlich: *Ein Roman aus der Werther-Zeit.* (*Archiv für Literaturgeschichte.*) Vol. X., p. 496-520. (Leipzig, 1881).
K. Freye: *Jean Pauls Flegeljahre.* (*Palaestra.* Vol. LXI., Berlin, 1907).
R. Rohde: *Jean Pauls Titan.* (*Palaestra.* Vol. CV., Berlin, 1920).

1/2/40

8157

LIBRARY
BRESCIA HALL, LONDON